

**Evaluation of the Teacher Quality Enhancement Project,
English Language Learner (ELL) Component**

Year 1 Report

Submitted to:

Iowa Department of Education
Mary Beth Schroeder-Fracek
Grimes State Office Building
Des Moines, Iowa 50319-0146

Submitted May 1, 2007

University of Iowa Center for Evaluation and Assessment Evaluation Staff:

Ellen Wolter, Xuan Wang, Burgess Smith, Vernita Morgan, Jennifer Jones, Kimberly
Granderson, Melissa Chapman, Jeanne Alnot, and
Don Yarbrough, Director
210 Lindquist Center
Iowa City, Iowa 52242
Coe-cea@uiowa.edu
<http://www.education.uiowa.edu/cea/>

COPYRIGHT: CENTER FOR EVALUATION AND ASSESSMENT MAY 2007

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	4
2. DESCRIPTION OF THE TQELL COMPONENT AND ITS CONTEXT	6
2.1. THE 2006 SUMMER INSTITUTE.....	6
2.2. IOWA CULTURE AND LANGUAGES CONFERENCE (ICLC).....	7
3. METHODOLOGY	7
3.1. PARTICIPANT OBSERVATIONS OF THE 2006 OUR KIDS SUMMER INSTITUTE	8
3.2. SURVEYS	8
3.2.1. ICLC 2006 surveys.....	8
3.2.2. April 2006 survey for TQELL participants not attending the ICLC.....	9
3.3.3. Summer Institute 2006 surveys.....	10
3.3.4. ICLC 2007 surveys.....	10
4. EVALUATION QUESTIONS AND FINDINGS.....	11
4.1. Q1 FINDINGS	11
4.1.1. Findings concerning educators' and candidates' needs from the ICLC 2006 surveys for TQELL participants, quantitative knowledge scale	12
4.1.2. Findings concerning educators' and candidates' needs from April 2006 Survey of TQELL participants who did not attend the ICLC.....	16
4.1.3. Findings concerning educators' and candidates' needs from the 2007 ICLC Survey	18
4.2. Q2 FINDINGS	21
4.2.1. What were the components and subcomponents of the 2006 Summer Institute?	21
4.2.2. How engaged were the teacher candidates and educators in the 2006 Summer Institute? Findings from the 2006 Summer Institute survey of <u>teacher candidates</u>	57
4.2.2 (continued). How engaged were the teacher candidates and educators in the 2006 Summer Institute? Findings from the 2006 Summer Institute survey of <u>teacher educators</u>	59
4.2.3. How many teacher educators and candidates have participated in the TQELL component and what are their demographic characteristics?	60
4.2.3.1. Findings from ICLC 2006 surveys	60
4.2.3.2 Findings from the April 2006 survey of TQELL Participants not at the ICLC	61
4.2.3.3. Findings from the 2006 Summer Institute demographics survey for teacher candidates	61
4.2.3.3 (continued). Findings from the 2006 Summer Institute demographics survey for teacher educators.....	62
4.2.3.4. Demographic summaries from 2007 ICLC survey of <u>teacher candidates</u>	63
4.2.3.4 (continued). Demographic summaries from 2007 ICLC survey of <u>teacher educators</u>	65
4.2.3.5. Frequency of Participation by Institution	68
4.3. Q3 FINDINGS	72
4.3.1. In what ways was participation in the 2006 ICLC beneficial? Information from the February and April surveys.	72
4.3.2. In what ways was participation in the 2006 Summer Institute beneficial? Findings from the survey of <u>teacher candidates</u>	72
4.3.3. In what ways was participation in the 2006 Summer Institute beneficial? Findings from the survey of <u>teacher candidates</u>	76
4.3.4. In what ways was participation in the 2007 ICLC beneficial? Findings from the survey of <u>teacher candidates</u>	78
4.3.5. In what ways was participation in the 2007 ICLC beneficial? Findings from the survey of <u>teacher educators</u>	83
4.4. Q4 FINDINGS	87
4.4.1. Findings from the Summer Institute 2006 survey of teacher candidates related to plans for using the information and support for school-based goals.....	88
4.4.2. Findings from the Summer Institute 2006 survey of teacher candidates related to use of knowledge, skills, and strategies.....	91
4.4.3. Findings from the ICLC 2007 survey of teacher candidates related to plans for using the information and support for school-based goals	95

4.4.4. Findings from the ICLC 2007 survey of teacher educators related to plans for using the information and support for school-based goals	96
4.5. Q5 FINDINGS	100
4.5.1. In what was could the project be improved? Findings from the Summer Institute 2006 survey of teacher candidates	100
4.5.2. In what was could the project be improved? Findings from the Summer Institute 2006 survey of teacher educators.....	102
4.5.3. In what was could the project be improved? Findings from the ICLC 2007 survey of teacher candidates	104
4.5.4. In what was could the project be improved? Findings from the ICLC 2007 survey of teacher educators.....	106
COMMENTS, DESIGN, AND NEXT STEPS	109
META-EVALUATION.....	109

1. Executive Summary

The Iowa Teacher Quality Enhancement Program (TQE) is a multi component intervention designed for system wide impact on the quality of teaching, teacher technological and other support, teacher in-service and pre-service preparation and development, and ultimately student achievement in the State of Iowa. This report focuses on the quality of the English Language Learner component only, one of a total of six components. Learning Points Associates (LPA) is investigating and reporting on the quality of the other components. The two evaluation sub-contractors, LPA and the University of Iowa Center for Evaluation and Assessment (CEA), have met regularly via conference calls to coordinate their efforts and are sharing drafts of their designs, instruments and reports. The LPA Evaluation Reports on the other five components are available under separate cover.

The CEA is also the third party evaluator for a parallel program, the Our Kids Program. The Our Kids Program provides a number of projects and subprojects to improve the teaching and learning of English Language Learners (ELL) in Iowa Schools. This program and its projects focus on in-service professional development for practicing teachers, staff, and administrators in the State of Iowa. Because of its prior evaluations of other ELL projects, the CEA was selected as the third party evaluator for the Teacher Quality Enhancement, English Language Learner (TQELL) component focused on the preparation of pre-service teachers (teacher candidates) and those who guide their training programs (teacher educators). The U.I. Center for Evaluation and Assessment is a Board of Regents approved, independent center in existence under charter since 1992 (<http://www.education.uiowa.edu/cea/>).

The TQELL component focuses primarily on helping teacher candidates become more adept at meeting the learning needs of English Language Learners. In order to make progress toward this goal in this grant year, staff recruited two cohorts of participants: (1) selected higher education faculty members who are involved in designing and delivering some of the state's teacher training programs, and (2) selected pre-service future teachers who are enrolled in these programs. In addition to planning and organizational efforts, this component has implemented three major opportunities for learning in this reporting period. A recurring annual event in the TQELL program is the Iowa Languages and Culture Conference (ICLC). It has been available for TQELL educators and candidates in February 2006 and again in February 2007. In these years, it has provided participating educators and candidates special opportunities to increase their learning about ELLs. A second major feature of the TQELL component is the 2006 ELL Summer Institute. It is described in detail on pages 21 through 57.

The number of participating higher education institutions, teacher educators and teacher candidates depends on the activity that is being described. In 2006, 19 higher education institutions (IHEs) were included with a total of 70 eligible teacher educators and candidates. However, the community colleges did not participate in 2007 and 2 more colleges joined resulting in a total of 14 IHEs with a total of approximately 150 eligible teacher educators and candidates (see Tables 20 & 21).

Not all eligible IHEs participated in any activity or provided information for this report. A total of 17 IHEs participated in the 2006 Summer Institute, sending a total of 38 educators. A total of 18 teacher educators from 10 of these 17 IHEs completed and returned evaluation forms. Only 4 of the 17 IHEs sent teacher candidates to the Summer Institute. Of the 16 teacher candidates registering, only 14 filled out and returned their evaluation forms. With regard to the 2007 ICLC, 12 IHEs sent a total of 31 teacher educators. A total of 17 teacher educators from 8 participating IHEs filled out and returned surveys. Eleven (of the 12) IHEs sent a total of 55 teacher candidates who registered for the ICLC. A total of 25 teacher candidates from 7 (of these 11) filled out and turned in surveys. Thus one goal for next year's evaluation is to increase the

response rate of participating IHEs and participating teacher educators and candidates. Tables 22 & 23 report these data in detail.

The evaluation findings from these three activities are organized by evaluation questions. Sections prior to the results are to aide the reader in understanding the nature of the professional development and the instruments used to evaluate the professional development. This report addresses five evaluation questions directly and is organized accordingly.

1. Given the overarching goal of improving the learning of ELLs in math, science, and language, what are the needs of the Institutes of Higher Education (IHE) participants, both teacher educators and teacher candidates, in order to best serve the ELLs' academic growth?
2. What are the key features of the TQELL component, how many educators and candidates have participated, and what was their evaluation of it, given Question 1 above?
3. In what ways has participation in the TQELL component been beneficial to teacher educators and teacher candidates?
4. How have teacher educators' and teacher candidates' planning, curricula, and teaching changed with regard to ELLs?
5. How might the TQELL component be improved in coming years?

Summary of Findings

With regard to question 1 (above), the needs of teacher candidates and teacher educators seemed to be aligned well with the information and skills being provided by the 2006 and 2007 ICLCs and by the 2006 Summer Institute. The needs of participants were investigated using three sources of evidence: the ICLC 2006 survey, quantitative section on knowledge; the April 2006 email survey; and the ICLC 2007 needs assessment section. The ICLC 2006 survey included 18 educators and 10 candidates, the April 2006 email survey included four educators and two candidates, and the ICLC 2007 survey included 17 educators and 25 candidates.

Teacher candidates and educators reported having relatively little knowledge in the following areas: the number of ELLs in Iowa, curricula that support ELL learning, barriers to the identification of talented and gifted ELLs, methods to improve the preparation of new teachers for ELLs, the educational needs of ELLs, and ways to improve teaching for ELLs in the content areas. On the 2007 ICLC survey, respondents indicated the extent to which various activities would be beneficial to them because of their needs. Both teacher candidates and teacher educators indicated a need for learning about potential cultural barriers, for observations of classrooms with ELLs, and for learning about effective communication with families of ELLs. The teacher candidates also mentioned learning strategies to integrate language skill building into the content areas. Teacher educators also expressed the need to view videos of ELL classrooms, hear first-hand accounts from ELLs, and study examples of exceptional teacher preparation programs.

With regard to evaluation question 2, the evaluation team engaged in extensive summary description of the 2006 Summer Institute, reported in later sections of this report. Participants in the 2006 and the 2007 ICLCs also provided reports of their engagement in the various daily sessions. In general, both candidates and educators reported appropriate degrees of engagement, although some sessions appeared to engage more participants than others. Participation has increased steadily over the course of this reporting period. The number of participating institutions of higher education is now at 14 and the number of candidates and educators has increased over the course of this grant year to approximately 150, near the upper limit of 155.

With regard to Question 3, teacher candidates and educators reported a number of benefits from participation in the 2006 Summer Institute, as well as from the ICLCs. However the degree of growth in skills and knowledge attributable to participation in the 2006 Summer Institute, as would be expected, was considerably greater than the degree of benefit participants

attribute to the ICLCs. Over all three events, candidates and educators reported growth in multiple skills and knowledge areas related to teaching ELLs. They reported greater confidence in their ability to conduct multiple instructional and support activities with ELLs than before their participation.

Findings related to Question 4 addressed specific plans and intentions to implement the new skills and knowledge that candidates and educators learned in their school- or university-based curriculum and instruction. Both candidates and educators reported numerous areas of learning from the ICLC and the 2006 Summer Institute that they intend to implement in their instruction and other classroom activities. Many reported specific strategies that they planned to implement. Future evaluation work will address whether and to what extent this implementation takes place.

Lastly, teacher candidates and educators addressed ways that the TQELL component could be improved in coming years. Most suggestions were echoed by only a few participants but are detailed in Section 4.5. A few candidates and educators mentioned specific sessions, such as keynote addresses or specific presenters at the ICLCs that could be improved. Others mentioned scheduling and facilities as needing improvement. For example, some mentioned that the weather was a problem for both ICLCs and that the Convention Center where the 2007 ICLC took place was too cold.

With regard to recommendations, this report finds much to evaluate positively with regard to all three events, especially specific aspects and presenters at the 2006 Summer Institute. In addition, a few changes have been recommended in previous reports and these recommended changes have been acted on positively. For example, a previous recommendation from the Interim Report that participants be given some degree of flexibility in selecting the presentations they will attend is being planned for the 2007 Summer Institute. In addition, the TQELL planning committee is considering how to disseminate materials and handouts.

Evaluation in the coming year will be focusing more intensively on changes in educators' curriculum and instruction for candidates and on candidates' impact on ELLs, once they become teachers. Those with an interest in or suggestions about the evaluation plans for next year are encouraged to contact the Center for Evaluation and Assessment.

2. Description of the TQELL Component and Its Context

The TQELL component has been facilitated by the existing programs and projects for in-service teachers in the State of Iowa. Relying on infrastructure and expertise through the Iowa Cultures and Languages Conference (ICLC) and the Summer Institute (originally designed for the Our Kids project but substantially revised and expanded in 2006), the TQELL component could move immediately to deliver professional development without a full year needed for planning and start-up, as is typically the case. Descriptions of each of these Teacher Professional Development (TPD) components are provided below.

2.1. The 2006 Summer Institute

The 2006 Summer Institute provided at least three days (for educators) and five days (for candidates) of presentations, mini-workshops, and simulations with participants in residence in Ames, Iowa. The majority of participants at the 2006 Summer Institute were in-service teachers from various levels, disciplines, and districts participating in the Our Kids project. Participants were organized into more than ten different strands of practicing teachers, depending on subject matter areas and grade levels taught and experience with prior summer institutes. TQELL educators and candidates participated in their dedicated cohorts. The evaluation of the 2006

Summer Institute from the perspective of the Our Kids participants is provided in a different report, available from the CEA.

Registration opened at 7 a.m. for all participants on Monday, August 7, 2006. The opening orientation began at 8 a.m. and lasted until 8:50. From 9 to 11 a.m., approximately one third of all participants (including TQELL Elementary teacher candidates) attended the James Crawford keynote address, *Education Policy and Language Politics: High Stakes for ELLs*. The lunch break and team meetings took place from 11 a.m. to 12:15 p.m. From 12:15 to 2:15 p.m., teacher candidates attended a session titled *Parents and Communities*, organized and presented by Vinh Nguyen. After a short break, they attended the *Life in a Second Language Simulation* from 2:30 to 4:30 p.m.

The TQELL teacher educators participated in the same events but in a different order. They attended the Vinh Nguyen *Parents and Community* session from 9 to 11 a.m., the *Life in a Second Language Simulation* from 12:15 until 2:15 p.m., and the James Crawford keynote address from 2:30 to 4:30 p.m.

A third cohort was available to TQE secondary teacher candidates; however, no secondary teacher candidates participated in the Summer Institute. The daily schedules for the TQELL candidates (through Friday) and for the educators (through Wednesday) are included in Appendix D.

The first section under Section 4, Evaluation Question 2 (*What are the key features of the TQELL component?*) provides thorough description of the experiences that teacher educators and candidates had at the 2006 Summer Institute.

2.2. Iowa Culture and Languages Conference (ICLC)

The ICLC is a two-day conference hosted annually for more than twenty years by the Iowa State Department Education. Interested TQE educators and candidates attended the ICLC in 2006 and in 2007. Based on sign-in sheets, 58 TQELL participants attended the February 2006 ICLC in Des Moines, Iowa. For the February 2007 ICLC in Des Moines, 81 TQE participants signed in.

The 2006 pre-conference started on February 14th at 2:00 p.m. The conference began the morning of February 15th at 7:45 a.m. and lasted until 9:00 p.m. Day two of the conference, February 16th, consisted of two sets of two-hour institutes in the morning, ending with lunch and a keynote speaker. Because of an ice storm, the evaluation team was unable to travel to the conference with the final versions of the evaluation survey for administration. Staff from Des Moines administered copies of the near final revision of the survey. Additional information on the survey distribution at this conference can be found in Section 3: *Methodology*, following this section.

The 2007 pre-conferences started on February 12th at 1:00 p.m. with a TQELL session for teacher educators and administrators. Day one conference activities started with registration at 7:30 a.m. followed by Dr. Lily Wong Fillmore, from 8:45 a.m. until 10:00 a.m. After Dr. Fillmore's plenary session, the TQELL participants had specific sessions to attend during the concurrent sessions, including (among others) an *Orientation to TQELL for new IHEs* and *Were we prepared to teach ELLs?*, featuring a panel of practicing teachers. Day two activities sessions ran from 8:30 a.m. to 10:30 a.m. and from 10:45 a.m. to 12:15 p.m. The TQE sessions included *ISU and You* and *Developing Cultural Literacy*. The major activities of the conference for TQE participants ended after that day's lunch keynote speaker, Dr. Jana Fox.

3. Methodology

A variety of procedures were used to collect information to address the five evaluation questions guiding this study. Details on the methods used and specific procedures for each of these methods are provided in the following subsections. Blank surveys are provided in Appendix A of this report.

3.1. Participant Observations of the 2006 Our Kids Summer Institute

Four evaluation team members attended all sessions of the 2006 Summer Institute as participant observers and provided detailed descriptions of the sessions as experienced by the TQELL (and Our Kids) participants. In addition, the U.I. Center for Evaluation and Assessment director attended planning meetings, pilot trials of the simulation, and selected sessions during the Summer Institute implementation. The participant observations were conducted by these evaluation team members: Vernita Morgan, Burgess Smith, Xuan Wang, Ellen Wolter, and Don Yarbrough, CEA Director. With regard to the qualifications of the evaluation team, all team members are experienced program evaluation staff and have graduate degrees in evaluation or are pursuing them. In addition, three of the team members have extensive public school teaching experience in multiple content areas.

The individual session (or presentation) observations followed a modified Extended Program Model (see Appendix C). Participant observers (evaluation team members) organized their observations to describe the following subcomponents of each session: the context, environment and participants; the resources, activities, and procedures; the needs and problems addressed; any immediate outcomes of note; intended or anticipated intermediate and long-term outcomes; and the guiding program theory for this session. The detailed observations are included as findings under Section 4, Question 2: *What are the key features of the TQELL component?*

3.2. Surveys

In collaboration with TQELL project staff and teacher teams, the U.I. Center for Evaluation and Assessment developed, reviewed, modified and revised seven evaluation surveys to investigate the experiences, learning, skill acquisition of other outcomes for teacher educators and teacher candidates who participated in the TQE professional development activities. Copies of all surveys are included in Appendix A.

3.2.1. ICLC 2006 surveys

In February 2006, 58 participants of the Teacher Quality Enhancement (TQE) program attended the ICLC in Des Moines, Iowa.¹ In an effort to acquire participants' opinions about their learning needs, the ICLC, working with English Language Learners (ELLs), and the TQE program, the CEA designed a survey to be administered following the last ICLC session. Specifically, the survey items offered participants an opportunity to provide feedback regarding their prior knowledge of ELLs and the value of their participation in the ICLC. Additionally, this survey aimed to help staff and other stakeholders better understand TQE participants' expectations for the TQE program.

Unfortunately, an ice storm left many participants and the CEA evaluator who was to administer the survey unable to attend the last day. Of the 58 attendees, only 31 completed a survey following the ICLC; survey respondents included 18 teacher educators, 10 teacher

¹ Please note that 73 TQE participants signed up to attend.

candidates, and three who identified themselves as having an ‘other’ professional status. In addition, because the survey administrator was unable to attend, the finalized survey did not reach the ICLC. As a result, conference coordinators administered a near final draft of the survey. Although relatively similar, seven items from the final revision were not administered to ICLC participants.

As a consequence of the survey implementation barriers described above, especially because not all participants had had the opportunity to respond to sections about their needs, the evaluation staff decided to redistribute the survey in April. To do this, the CEA developed an online or “web” survey, as well as an email survey, using the final draft of the survey that was not implemented. This survey was referred to as the *ICLC April Survey*, as it was administered to all who had attended or planned to attend the ICLC in April 2006. The two surveys, called the February and April versions are clarified below.

- ***February ICLC Survey:*** Administered in February 2006 immediately following the last session of the ICLC. Participants attending the last day of the ICLC received a paper copy of this survey and were asked to provide feedback. The survey contained four parts. Part I included 13 items inquiring about participants’ prior knowledge of ELLs, Part II included nine items about participants’ perceived value of the ICLC, Part III contained six open-ended items about expectations for the Teacher Quality Enhancement program, and Part IV consisted of seven demographic items.
- ***April ICLC Survey:*** This survey was administered in April 2006 as an online survey and an email survey, two months following the ICLC. Seven survey items that were not included on the *February ICLC Survey* version (as described above) were included on this survey. All participants (including those who responded to the February ICLC survey) received this survey via email. The email provided a brief explanation about the survey and the inclement weather for the ICLC in February. Participants had the option of either completing the survey online or through email. To complete the survey online, participants clicked on the URL, responded to the survey items, and submitted the survey online. If participants completed the survey through email, they responded to the survey items that were provided within the email from the evaluation staff. Finally, participants had the option to print out the email survey and send it to the U.I. Center for Evaluation and Assessment through the US Postal Service. The survey contained four parts. Part I included 15 items about participants’ prior knowledge of ELLs, Part II included 15 items about how participants valued the ICLC, Part III contained six open-ended items about expectations for the Teacher Quality Enhancement program, and Part IV consisted of ten demographic items.

Although each survey was analyzed separately, the February and April surveys will be discussed together because the majority of items and the results were similar. In Part I of the February survey, all items are identical, except for items 7 and 13 which were revised on the April survey into items 12-15. In Part II, all items are identical except for item 4 on the February survey which was revised and split into items 4-6 on the April survey. All Part III items on both surveys are identical, as are all Part IV items; however, the following three items were added: *Have you participated in the Our Kids Institutes before? Are you a lead team member? Do you consider yourself experienced with ELL?*

3.2.2. April 2006 survey for TQELL participants not attending the ICLC

This April 2006 survey was administered as both an online survey and an email survey to TQELL participants who did not attend the ICLC. All survey items pertaining to the TQELL program and prior knowledge of ELLs were included and survey items concerning the ICLC were removed. The procedures for this survey were the same as described for the *April ICLC Survey*. The goal of this survey was to identify the needs of TQELL participants who did not have an opportunity to respond to the February and April ICLC surveys. Respondents included four teacher educators and two teacher candidates.

3.3.3. Summer Institute 2006 surveys

Two surveys, one for the teacher educators and another for the teacher candidates, were constructed for the TQELL evaluation of the 2006 Summer Institute. The candidate and educator surveys consisted of a quantitative section, a demographic section, and a set of open-ended items. The quantitative scales addressed three aspects of candidates' and educators' experiences: their confidence in their specific abilities, their intention to use information and skills from specific sessions, and their degree of engagement in specific sessions. The surveys were drafted by U.I. Center for Evaluation and Assessment staff and then reviewed and critiqued by staff and teacher team leaders multiple times before being finalized. At the Summer Institute, the surveys were administered at regularly scheduled times on the last afternoons (Wednesday for the teacher educators and Friday for the teacher candidates.) Evaluation team members provided respondents with consent forms and explanations prior to collecting the surveys. All survey responses were anonymous.

Open-ended items were analyzed by individual evaluation staff working alone, and the educators' and candidates' responses were used to create categories. All responses are included in Appendix E of this report for those who want to conduct a reanalysis or simply review the individual comments for a complete review.

3.3.4. ICLC 2007 surveys

As of February 2007 there were approximately 150 teacher educators and candidates enrolled in the TQE project; 81 attended the ICLC from one to three days as indicated by the TQE sign-in sheet. Of these, a total of 42 (25 teacher candidates and 17 teacher educators) responded to the 2007 TQE survey. An additional three teacher candidates took the survey constructed for the teacher educators; for these three only the demographic responses and open-ended questions that were asked on both surveys could be included in the results.

The candidate and educator surveys consisted of three quantitative sections, a demographic section, and a set of open-ended questions. The quantitative scales included a retrospective pre-post scale of knowledge before and after the ICLC, value ranking of specific aspects of the ICLC, and a needs assessment of possible activities that would be viewed as useful to the respondents. This third scale was constructed by reviewing open-ended responses on prior surveys completed by TQE participants.

Both surveys were constructed and finalized by the U.I. Center for Evaluation and Assessment. Surveys with a tear-off consent form were distributed at the ICLC by a TQELL project leader (Karen Nichols) to each TQELL participant during registration. Non-respondents were tracked using the consent form and one courtesy reminder was sent via email. Three teacher educators and one teacher candidate provided surveys following this reminder.

Open-ended items were analyzed by individual evaluation staff working alone, and the educators' and candidates' responses were used to create categories. All responses are included in Appendix E of this report for those who want to conduct a reanalysis or simply review the individual comments for a complete review.

4. Evaluation Questions and Findings

The findings based on analyses of these information sources are organized by five research/evaluation questions. These questions are as follows:

1. Given the overarching goal of improving the learning of ELLs in math, science, and language, what are the needs of the Institutes of Higher Education (IHE) participants, both teacher educators and teacher candidates, in order to best serve the ELLs' academic growth?
2. What are the key features of the TQELL component, how many educators and candidates have participated, and what was their evaluation of it, given Question 1 above?
3. In what ways has participation in the TQELL component been beneficial to teacher educators and teacher candidates?
4. How have teacher educators' and teacher candidates' planning, curricula, and teaching changed with regard to ELLs?
5. How might the TQELL component be improved in coming years?

The first two questions were selected to evaluate the extent to which the program activities and the participants' needs were aligned. Further, questions three and five were selected to provide formative feedback on the ways in which program participation has been beneficial and ways in which the project may be improved in Year Two. The fourth question was selected to evaluate the extent to which changes in participants' behavior has occurred with regard to ELL students; further evidence will be collected toward answering this question in subsequent evaluation years.

In addition to these questions, the evaluation plan for coming year will address additional questions specific to teacher educators' practices in Year Two of their participation and teacher candidates' practices with ELLs after they have entered the teaching profession. Subsequent evaluation reports will also address how to assess and evaluate the impact of the TQELL project on selected ELLs in the new teachers' classrooms.

The following subsections for each question present the evaluation findings based on analyses of the methods described in the preceding section. Findings are organized by research/evaluation question; therefore results from each method or survey are not reported in their entirety without interruption. Readers interested in the instruments and complete findings for a specific instrument should contact the U.I. Center for Evaluation and Assessment for a copy of the formative and interim reports or for other additional information.

4.1. Q1 Findings

Given the overarching goal of improving the learning of ELLs in math, science, and language, what are the needs of the Institutes of Higher Education (IHE) participants, both teacher educators and teacher candidates, in order to best serve the ELLs' academic growth?

The needs of participants were investigated using three sources of evidence: the ICLC 2006 survey, quantitative section on knowledge; the April 2006 email survey; and the ICLC 2007 needs assessment section. Details are organized below by instrument. The ICLC 2006 survey included 18 educators and 10 candidates, the April 2006 email survey included four educators and two candidates, and the ICLC 2007 survey included 17 educators and 25 candidates. The following paragraph provides a summary of the reported needs across these instruments.

Across the survey results presented below, teacher candidates and educators reported lower amounts of knowledge in the following areas: the number of ELLs in Iowa, curricula that

support ELL learning, barriers to the identification of talented and gifted ELLs, methods to improve the preparation of new teachers for ELLs, the educational needs of ELLs, and ways to improve teaching for ELLs in the content areas. On the 2007 ICLC survey, respondents indicated the extent to which various activities would be beneficial. Both teacher candidates and teacher educators indicated the following activities as being the most beneficial: learning about potential cultural barriers, observations of classrooms with ELLs, and learning about effective communication with families of ELLs. For the teacher candidates, other activities that had the highest means included learning strategies to integrate language skill building into the content areas. For the teacher educators, high means were also found for viewing videos of ELL classrooms, hearing first-hand accounts from ELLs, and viewing examples of exceptional teacher preparation programs.

4.1.1. Findings concerning educators' and candidates' needs from the ICLC 2006 surveys for TQELL participants, quantitative knowledge scale

The first quantitative section of the ICLC 2006 survey asked respondents, which included 18 teacher educators and 10 teacher candidates, to indicate their knowledge concerning various ELL issues prior to the ICLC. In responding to the survey, participants used the following scale:

Very Knowledgeable						Not at all Knowledgeable
6	5	4	3	2	1	

As demonstrated by Table 1 below, most educators reported the highest knowledge prior to the ICLC regarding *the educational needs of ELLs, ways to improve teaching for ELL students, and the social needs of ELL students*. Educators reported being less knowledgeable about *the numbers of ELL students in Iowa, barriers to identification of gifted and talented ELL students, and curricula that support ELL student learning*.

Table 1

Descriptive statistics of educators' reported knowledge regarding ELLs from the February 2006 survey

<i>How knowledgeable were you about each of the following before the start of the ICLC?</i>	Frequencies						<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>
	6	5	4	3	2	1		
The educational needs of ELLs	2	1	7	5	3	0	3.67	1.19
The number of ELLs in Iowa	1	2	2	4	8	1	2.94	1.35
The number of ELLs in your district or school	1	5	2	2	5	1	3.50	1.55
Barriers to ELLs learning in English and Language Arts	1	0	8	4	5	0	3.33	1.08
Barriers to ELLs learning in math classes	0	4	5	3	6	0	3.39	1.20
Barriers to ELLs learning in science classes	0	4	3	4	7	0	3.22	1.22
Ways to improve teaching for ELL students	2	3	5	4	4	0	3.72	1.32

Methods to improve the preparation of new teachers for ELL students	3	0	4	3	7	1		3.22	1.56
Pedagogical techniques that support ELL learning	3	2	4	3	5	1		3.56	1.58
Curricula that support ELL student learning	1	1	5	1	9	1		2.94	1.35
Barriers to identification of gifted and talented ELLs	0	2	3	4	6	3		2.72	1.27
The social needs of ELLs	2	3	5	3	5	0		3.67	1.37
Ways to improve the teaching of ELLs in the content areas you teach.	0	1	4	4	2	1		3.08	1.31

n=18

As demonstrated by Table 2 below, most candidates reported the highest knowledge prior to the ICLC regarding *the educational needs of ELLs* and *ways to improve teaching for ELL students*. Candidates reported having less knowledge about *the numbers of ELL students in Iowa*, *curricula that support ELL student learning*, and *barriers to identification of gifted and talented ELL students*.

Table 2

Descriptive statistics of candidates' reported knowledge regarding ELLs from the February 2006 survey

<i>How knowledgeable were you about each of the following before the start of the ICLC?</i>	Frequencies						<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>
	<i>6</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>1</i>		
The educational needs of ELLs	1	1	2	3	3	0	3.40	1.35
The number of ELLs in Iowa	0	1	1	1	3	4	2.20	1.40
The number of ELLs in your district or school	0	3	0	3	1	2	3.11	1.62
Barriers to ELLs learning in English and Language Arts	1	1	2	1	5	0	3.20	1.48
Barriers to ELLs learning in math classes	0	0	2	0	8	0	2.40	0.84
Barriers to ELLs learning in science classes	0	0	2	1	7	0	2.50	0.85
Ways to improve teaching for ELL students	1	2	2	1	4	0	3.50	1.51
Methods to improve the preparation of new teachers for ELL students	0	0	2	2	3	3	2.30	1.16
Pedagogical techniques that support ELL learning	1	0	1	1	5	1	2.67	1.50
Curricula that support ELL student learning	1	0	0	1	5	3	2.20	1.48
Barriers to identification of gifted and talented ELLs	0	0	2	0	5	3	2.10	1.10
The social needs of ELLs	1	2	0	2	5	0	3.20	1.55
Ways to improve the teaching of ELLs in the content areas you teach.	1	0	1	1	3	1	2.86	1.68

n=10

Qualitative, Questions 1-6

Items from Section III of this survey were open-ended; the evaluation team constructed categories from the data, which are reported by item. The survey items from the February and the April 2006 ICLC surveys consist of the same six open-ended items. Common themes were constructed from the individual responses for both surveys individually. These themes are discussed below.

The majority of responses to the first item, *In what ways has participating in the ICLC been useful to you?*, fell into one of the following three categories:

- Provided useful ideas such as resources, teaching methods, ideas and/or materials (April, n=6; February, n=18)
 - 11 responses from teacher educators in February, 3 responses in April
 - 6 responses from teacher candidates in February, 3 responses in April
 - 1 response from other professional status in February
- Increased knowledge of ELLs' issues and background (April, n=5; February, n=11)
 - 6 responses from teacher educators in February, 3 responses in April
 - 3 responses from teacher candidates in February
 - 2 responses from other professional status in February, 2 responses in April
- Making connections with other teachers/discussion with other (April, n=6, February, n=3)
 - All responses from teacher educators

Although respondents for the April 2006 ICLC survey produced fewer responses in the first two categories, two additional categories emerged from the April survey responses that did not emerge from the February survey responses. The additional categories included provided information/ideas to share with pre-service teachers (4 educators), and gained specific knowledge/appreciated specific conference presenter (2 educators, 1 other status).

In response to item 2, *What would you like to accomplish by participating in the TQE program?* the majority of responses, from both the February and April surveys, were included in one of the following categories:

- Prepare future educators/Educate pre-service teachers (April, n=8; February, n=13)
 - All responses from teacher educators
- Gain specific skills for teaching and helping ELLs (April, n=8; February, n=14)
 - 6 responses from teacher educators in February, 3 responses in April
 - 6 responses from teacher candidates in February, 3 responses in April
 - 2 responses from other professional status in February, 2 responses in April
- Increase self-knowledge about multicultural education and ELLs (April, n=7; February, n=4)
 - 2 responses from teacher educators in February, 5 responses in April
 - 2 responses from teacher candidates in February, 1 response in April
 - 1 response from other professional status in April

Two teacher candidates on the February survey also indicated they would like to “receive better resources” for teaching and helping ELL students during the TQE program. Three candidates on the April survey hoped to “become a better ELL teacher” by participating in the TQE program.

Congruent categories also emerged for the third item which asked, *What can be done to make your continued participation in the TQE program most beneficial to you and the students you teach?* The following categories emerged from the responses:

- Communication/collaboration with other TQE educators (April, n=2; February, n=2)
 - 1 response from a teacher educator in February, 1 response in April
 - 1 response from a teacher candidate in February, 1 response in April
- Provide lesson topics or ideas for teaching ELLs (April, n=2; February, n=4)
 - 1 response from a teacher educator in February, 1 response in April
 - 3 responses from teacher candidates in February, 1 response in April
- Additional suggestions for next conference (April, n=8; February, n=6)
 - 3 responses from teacher educators in February, 3 responses in April
 - 3 responses from teacher candidates in February, 3 responses in April
 - 2 responses from other professional status in April

One candidate and one educator on the February survey also indicated that increased awareness “of all conferences and time commitment” as well as “any advance notice of activities” in the grant would be helpful during their TQE participation. Two educators on the April survey requested “more info on preparing pre service teachers for a classroom that has a higher and higher percentage of ELLs.”

In response to item 4, which asked participants to *Describe your previous preparation or experience teaching ELLs or preparing other teachers to teach ELLs*, the following five categories emerged:

- None/No experience (April, n=7; February, n=6)
 - 3 responses from teacher educators in February, 2 responses in April
 - 2 responses from teacher candidates in February, 3 responses in April
 - 1 response from other professional status in February, 2 responses in April
- Pre-Service/still training (April, n=3; February n=2)
 - All responses from teacher candidates
- Little/some experience (April, n=5; February, n=5)
 - 4 responses from teacher educators in February, 4 responses in April
 - 1 response from teacher candidate in February
 - 1 response from other professional status in April
- Bilingual/Multi-cultural education (April, n=7; February, n=4)
 - 4 responses from teacher educators in February, 6 responses in April
 - 1 response from teacher candidate in April
- Experience teaching ELLs (April, n=3; February, n=7)
 - 6 responses from teacher educators in February, 3 responses in April
 - 1 response from teacher candidate in February

The February and April survey responses to the fifth item varied more substantially than the other items described above. The fifth item asked the following two questions, 1) *As a teacher educator, teacher, or future educator, what topics and issues would you like to learn more about to better prepare you to teach diverse learners, especially ELL students?* and 2) *Are there specific courses or workshop topics that would help you?* Only two common categories emerged from the February and April survey responses. In one category, communicating with parents and families of ELL students (April, n=2 educators; February, n=2, one educator and one other status), respondents expressed their desire to better understand “how to specifically help/work with ESL students [and] how to work with families of ESL students.” In the other category, gaining specific strategies/techniques for teaching in the classroom (April, n=9; February, n=10), respondents hoped to gain strategies for teaching ELL students in a specific subject matter or grade level using culturally appropriate and inclusive methods. Responses in this category included teacher candidates (February=5, April=3), teacher educators (February=4, April=4), and other professional status respondents (February =1, April =2).

Additional, and more specific, categories emerged from the April survey responses. For example, several candidates also hoped to better understand how to help ELL students in areas of literature, reading, writing, math, and science. One educator also requested more information on how to integrate “language skill building into all subjects.” Additional requests from April educators included how to locate community resources such as “products that might enhance the learning of ELL students”(1), how to work with special needs ELL students (4), and better understanding how to prepare teacher candidates to teach ELLs (4). February respondents suggested additional information on “how to incorporate cultural attitudes and related needs into the classroom”(2 candidates, 1 educator, 1 other) and one educator reported a need for better understanding of ELL problems and needs such as “issues of poverty.”

On the sixth item, which asked for *other expectations, wishes, comments, or suggestions*, the primary response was either a general positive comment about the ICLC and Summer Institute, a “no comment,” or suggestions for improvement. Three February respondents, including two candidates and one educator, requested moving the Summer Institute to earlier in the summer. One candidate wrote, “It would be nice if the [Summer Institute] was in May or early June for those of us who are students and cannot take a week away from summer jobs.” Additional suggestions from February respondents included one educator that requested more “hands on experience,” another educator who requested more “time to work with people on one current issues/questions,” and one candidate who requested “programs on how to teach language with no particular emphasis. The April survey included one candidate who requested “more sessions that speak specifically about ELL strategies to enhance learning” and one educator who requested “focusing on specific techniques for the full range of learners.” One educator also suggested revising the reimbursement process because it was “slightly untraditional.” We interpreted this to mean that it did not follow exactly the conventions that the respondent was already familiar with.

4.1.2. Findings concerning educators’ and candidates’ needs from April 2006 Survey of TQELL participants who did not attend the ICLC

The first section of the April 2006 survey addressed knowledge about ELLs. Frequencies are reported in Table 3; respondents reported lower levels of knowledge regarding the *educational needs of ELLs, methods to improve the preparation of new teachers for ELLs, curricula that support ELLs’ learning, barriers to identification of gifted and talented ELLs, and ways to improve teaching in math, science, and other content areas.*

Table 3

Frequencies of respondents reported knowledge regarding ELLs

<i>How knowledgeable were you about each of the following before the start of the ICLC?</i>	Frequencies							<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>
	<i>6</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>1</i>			
The educational needs of ELLs	1	0	1	3	1	1		3.14	1.57
The number of ELLs in Iowa	2	0	1	1	2	1		3.43	1.99
The number of ELLs in your district or school	2	0	1	0	3	1		3.29	2.06
Barriers to ELLs learning in English and Language Arts	1	1	3	1	0	1		3.86	1.57

Barriers to ELLs learning in math classes	1	0	3	1	0	2		3.29	1.80
Barriers to ELLs learning in science classes	1	0	3	1	0	2		3.29	1.80
Methods to improve the preparation of new teachers for ELL students	1	0	1	3	0	2		3.00	1.73
Pedagogical techniques that support ELL learning	1	1	2	0	2	0		3.83	1.60
Curricula that support ELL student learning	1	1	0	1	2	2		2.86	1.95
Barriers to identification of gifted and talented ELLs	1	1	0	2	0	3		2.86	2.04
The social needs of ELLs	1	0	4	0	0	2		3.43	1.81
Ways to improve the teaching of ELLs in math	1	1	0	3	0	2		3.14	1.86
Ways to improve the teaching of ELLs in science	1	1	0	3	0	2		3.14	1.86
Ways to improve the teaching of ELL in language arts	0	1	2	1	0	2		3.00	1.67
Ways to improve teaching in other content areas.	0	1	0	1	2	1		2.60	1.52

The next section of the survey consisted of open-ended questions. Given the small number of respondents, responses were not put into categories and are instead listed individually under each question.

1. What would you like to accomplish by participating in the Teacher Quality Enhancement program?

- I would like to learn strategies for teaching content area subjects for ELL.
- I would like to learn what to do to prepare preservice teachers for teaching ELL
- learn methods that are beneficial to ELL students;-ways to involve parents
- To increase the capacity of teachers and teacher educators able to meet the need of ELLs
- I would like to learn how to better meet the needs of ELL students. Enhance my knowledge and understanding of their situation so I may apply helpful accommodations in the classroom
- learn more about Language learners and how I can be an effective educator for them.

2. What can be done to make your continued participation in the TQE program most beneficial to you and the students you teach?

- Demonstrations. simulations of teaching ELL students using strategies that research says work
- Make some of the offerings specific for preparing preservice teachers.
- funds;-times that are workable
- Some support for our faculty team to provide incentives for continued meeting. It's hard to get my faculty team to want to come to meetings, etc. when there is no tangible incentive. Even funds for boxed lunches, etc. would make a difference in keeping our faculty team interested
- Information on the newest materials and successful techniques

3. Describe your previous preparation or experience teaching ELLs or preparing other teachers to teach ELLs.

- I have volunteered in an ELL classroom to learn about the students and methods teachers are using.
- None
- -various books and articles;-workshops
- This is my area of expertise so I have advanced (M.A. and Ph.D.) training
- I have had no direct contact with teaching ELLs. I am at the beginning of my education

program, and have had some information about ELLs in the classroom.

- none—preservice

4. As a teacher educator, teacher, or future educator, what topics and issues would you like to learn more about to better prepare you to teach diverse learners, especially ELL students? Are there specific courses or workshop topics that would help you?

- teaching strategies for ELL; assessment of ELL; accommodations for ELL
- programs that have been successful;-information about two-way immersion;-comparative studies from states who have been involved in this for a while
- Workshops on academic language in all the content areas
- What are the cultural barriers for the student and their family?
- As a future educator I think it would be beneficial to have workshops that dealt with where to go for help in a classroom that has ELL students. What are available resources? How do you apply what you know/learn to specific situations?
- no idea

5. Any other expectations, wishes, comments, or suggestions?

- Thanks for a great opportunity. This is a wonderful initiative that could be a model for the rest of the country
- Like stated previously, I am a future educator in a teacher preparation program. The conference I went to in February was the first professional development conference I have ever attended. I think it was a little overwhelming to me, but at the same time hugely beneficial. I have to say, not knowing what to expect, I had a great time, and it made me more excited than ever about becoming a teacher. I also have very little experience with ELL students, and it opened my eyes to their needs. Also, my favorite workshop was with Tim Rasinski. My endorsement area is in reading, and attending that workshop was extremely beneficial, and has even given me great ideas for lessons I have done in my college classes.

4.1.3. Findings concerning educators' and candidates' needs from the 2007 ICLC Survey

The third quantitative section of the 2007 ICLC survey allowed respondents to agree or disagree with statements regarding activities that may better prepare them to meet the needs of ELLs. Respondents included 17 teacher educators and 25 teacher candidates. As in the previous year, the scale for each item was a Likert type *strongly agree* to *strongly disagree* scale. The directions for this section were as follows:

Using the scale below, please rate each of the following activities indicating how strongly you agree or disagree that they would help you become better prepared to educate ELLs. If the statement does not apply to you, you have no opinion, or you choose not to respond, please circle "nr."

The scale was as follows:

Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Reponse
SA (6)	Ma (5)	Sa (4)	Sd (3)	Md (2)	SD (1)	nr

Table 4 below lists the frequencies, means, and standard deviations of responses related to skills and actions for the 25 teacher candidates who participated and responded. Table 4 is organized by mean in descending order so that the highest reported mean, for Item 4, is the first listed item.

Table 4

Teacher candidates' reported activity needs toward preparation to teach ELLs

<i>The following activities would be helpful in preparing me to teach ELLs:</i>	Frequencies						<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>
	<i>6</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>1</i>		
4. Observing classrooms with ELLs	16	7	2	0	0	0	5.56	0.65
13. Learning about potential cultural barriers	16	6	3	0	0	0	5.52	0.71
14. Hearing ideas about effective communication with the families of ELLs	15	7	3	0	0	0	5.48	0.71
12. Learning about strategies for integrating language skill building into content area subjects	15	6	3	1	0	0	5.40	0.87
16. Learning about strategies to teach writing skills to ELLs	13	8	2	1	0	0	5.38	0.82
2. Hearing first-hand accounts from ELLs	12	9	4	0	0	0	5.32	0.75
3. Viewing modeling of actual lessons for ELLs	13	7	5	0	0	0	5.32	0.8
5. Talking with practicing mainstream classroom teachers	11	11	3	0	0	0	5.32	0.69
11. Learning about strategies for identifying ELLs who have special needs	11	8	4	0	0	0	5.30	0.76
15. Learning about strategies to teach writing skills to ELLs	11	10	4	0	0	0	5.28	0.74
18. Acquiring information on academic language versus everyday language	10	12	1	2	0	0	5.20	0.87
9. Taking part in a second language simulation	7	10	4	0	0	0	5.14	0.73
10. Learning about strategies for identifying talented and gifted ELLs	11	7	4	2	0	0	5.13	0.99
8. Acquiring strategies on using traditional assessments to test ELLs	8	12	2	2	0	0	5.08	0.88
7. Acquiring information on alternative assessments for ELLs	8	11	3	2	0	0	5.04	0.91
1. Viewing videos of ELL classrooms	7	10	7	1	0	0	4.88	0.97
17. Acquiring information on dual language programs	7	8	6	1	1	0	4.83	1.07
20. Learning about legal issues related to ELLs	4	11	7	1	0	0	4.78	0.8
6. Talking with other TQE participants	3	10	10	0	1	0	4.58	0.88
19. Being paired with another TQE participant during conferences such as the ICLC	0	5	6	6	3	1	3.52	1.17

n=25

Table 5 below lists the means and standard deviations of responses related to skills and actions for the 17 teacher educators who participated and responded. Table 5 is organized by mean in descending order so that the highest reported mean, for Item 12, is the first listed item.

Table 5

Teacher educators' reported activity needs toward preparation to train teacher candidates

<i>The following activities would be helpful in preparing me to train teacher candidates:</i>	Frequencies							<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>
	<i>6</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>1</i>			
12. Learning about strategies for integrating language skill building into content area subjects	12	4	0	0	0	0		5.75	0.45
13. Learning about potential cultural barriers	11	5	1	0	0	0		5.59	0.62
1. Viewing videos of ELL classrooms	10	5	2	0	0	0		5.47	0.72
2. Hearing first-hand accounts from ELLs	9	7	1	0	0	0		5.47	0.62
3. Seeing examples of exceptional teacher preparation programs	10	5	2	0	0	0		5.47	0.72
4. Observing classrooms with ELLs	11	4	1	1	0	0		5.47	0.87
14. Hearing ideas about effective communication with the families of ELLs	8	9	0	0	0	0		5.47	0.51
9. Taking part in a second language simulation	8	6	3	0	0	0		5.29	0.77
11. Learning about strategies for identifying ELLs who have special needs	6	7	2	0	0	0		5.27	0.70
7. Acquiring information on alternative assessments for ELLs	5	11	1	0	0	0		5.24	0.56
15. Learning about strategies to boost the non-cognitive skills of ELLs (e.g., self-confidence)	9	4	3	1	0	0		5.24	0.97
16. Learning about strategies to teach writing skills to ELLs	6	9	2	0	0	0		5.24	0.66
5. Talking with practicing mainstream classroom teachers	7	6	4	0	0	0		5.18	0.81
10. Learning about strategies for identifying talented and gifted ELLs	6	6	2	1	0	0		5.07	1.10
8. Acquiring strategies on using traditional assessments to test ELLs	3	12	2	0	0	0		5.06	0.56
18. Acquiring information on academic language versus everyday language	6	6	3	1	0	0		5.06	0.93
6. Talking with other TQE participants	5	7	3	1	1	0		4.82	1.13
17. Acquiring information on dual language programs	4	7	5	1	0	0		4.82	0.88
20. Learning about language issues related to ELLs	4	7	4	0	1	0		4.81	1.05
19. Being paired with another TQE participant during conferences such as the ICLC	2	2	7	2	2	0		4.00	1.20

n=17

4.2. Q2 Findings

What are the key features of the TQELL component, how many educators and candidates have participated, and what was their evaluation of it, given Question 1 above?

Evidence toward answering the second set of evaluation questions is organized into two major pieces. The first segment reports the nature and most important features of the professional development as it took place in the TQELL component. Evidence reported here includes participant observations of the 2006 Summer Institute and a quantitative survey scale from the 2006 Summer Institute regarding engagement in those sessions. The second segment reports the number of participants in the TQELL program. Because demographic information was included on each of the seven surveys included in this report, there is an emerging picture of the participation based on respondents to specific surveys as well as numbers of TQELL participants who have officially enrolled (see for example, Tables 20 and 21).

4.2.1. What were the components and subcomponents of the 2006 Summer Institute?

The 2006 Summer Institute began on Monday, August 7 and continued for one work week, through Friday. Teacher educators participated in an intact strand that completed on Wednesday, August 9, when they filled out their evaluation survey. However, they were free to continue participating through Friday if they so chose. Teacher candidates participated through Friday in an intact strand, and filled out their survey on Friday afternoon, August 11.

Four CEA staff members participated in the sessions as observers and wrote up their observations using an Expanded Project Model (see Appendix C). Because of scheduling issues, sometimes more than one observer was attending the same session, and on occasion, only one observer was able to attend only a part of the session. The following subsections are organized to present the daily sessions as experienced by the teacher educators and candidates in some degree of detail. The summaries of these observations for daily sessions are included in the following chronologically ordered subsections sections, concluding on page 57.

Monday, August 7, Teacher Candidates and Teacher Educators Strands

The events taking place on Monday included the morning orientation, the *Life in a Second Language* simulation and discussion, James Crawford's *Keynote*, and Vinh Nguyen's *Parents and Community*. Please refer to the schedules (Appendix D) to follow the orders in which the teacher candidates and the teacher educators participated.

Life in a Second Language Simulation and Discussion

- Context, Environment, & Participants

This session occurred on Monday afternoon for both TQE candidates and educators, though during different times. The simulation occurred in a large area with room to walk around and more than twenty tables. Many volunteers and staff orchestrated the simulation using a number of proprietary and non-proprietary documents, props, and pictures. The simulation went through several trials, and volunteers and staff were needed to try out the simulation before it was implemented at the Summer Institute. One evaluation team member (the CEA Director) participated in the "dress rehearsal" as a family member and provided informal formative evaluative information to the Summer Institute director and organizers.

- Resources, Activities, & Procedures

This was a complex activity that revolved around the participants (including teacher candidates, practicing teachers, and educators who were assumed to speak English and no other language) receiving an English language document that informed them of a role they were supposed to play (a new immigrant or refugee to the imaginary country). Then, the participants went to the “country” (the conference room, aka, *Polyopolis*) and tried to fulfill a set of objectives outlined in the document they received. In the simulation, no citizens of *Polyopolis* spoke English. *Polyopolis* consisted of a number of booths, each representing a workplace, school, government office or other such public facility. Later, the participants broke into groups to discuss their experiences.

Participants began the simulation by going to a special room with other members of their cohorts where they were assigned to specific families and to specific roles in their families. Participants were assigned to the roles of mother or father, daughter/sister or son/brother of any functioning age. Assignment was not gender congruent with one’s real life gender. Identifying characteristics of the family were also assigned, including economic conditions, presence or absence of documentation needed for identity, prior education, economic, emotional, and other types of conditions on arrival to *Polyopolis*, health/illness, and other characteristics that might have an impact on ability to survive and adjust in the new city/state *Polyopolis*.

After assignments, family members came together to travel down the hall to *Polyopolis*. They had received a set of tasks which needed to be completed, for example, enroll a child in school, get papers necessary to function, deal with the police, go to a clinic for medical care or immunization, and so forth. To complete these tasks they were required to go to a series of stations, staffed by bureaucrats who spoke different languages such as Arabic, Farsi, Korean, Japanese, Spanish, Bosnian, Portuguese and perhaps others. There were 19 different stations. On occasion, families had a speaker of the language that was needed at one or more stations. However, that was the exception rather than the rule. The volunteers staffing the stations were all native speakers, and were free to take on their roles as they felt they should. Some were brusque and officious while some were kind and helpful. However, none spoke English during the simulation. For approximately one hour, families tried to enter the new country and to solve some of their tasks.

The lines were long. Sometimes when a family finally reached the desk, they had a piece of paper shoved into their hand to fill out in a language they did not understand. They were asked in a language they did not understand for documents they did not have. Some families were asked for a home address when they did not yet have any place to live. The room had all of the simulated pressure and frustration of the immigration lines at border control stations. However, there was also a lot of laughter, hustle and bustle, and family bonding going on. Not all families were poor; some were advantaged and seemed to get pots of gold from nowhere or get-out-of-trouble-free cards.

After approximately one hour, a whistle blew and people were instructed to stop the simulation. Everybody went back to their respective rooms. Two group leaders organized a discussion and took notes on a flip chart about participants’ comments. They followed a specific schedule/script and discussed the objectives of this upcoming discussion section, which lasted 45 minutes.

Participants were organized into small discussion groups, but not with members of their “families”. As soon as this happened, group members seemed eager to talk about their experiences. Some members observed that several immigrants/refugees were assertive, but others were passive. They talked about how they had various levels of success; some people got “deported”, some got “arrested”, some people met their goals but others did not. Most participants seemed to have had a lot of challenging experiences. One group leader went around and informed each group that they had only three minutes left (out of ten) to discuss challenges.

There were two sheets up on the wall: “barriers in access” and “emotions.” When people spoke about barriers, for example, they mentioned such things as:

- | | |
|------------------------------|-------------------------|
| - Money | - Self-confidence |
| - Language | - Dependency on English |
| - Bureaucracy | - Refusal to interact |
| - Lack of documentation | - Priorities |
| - Attitude | - Not enough time |
| - Conflict within the family | |

The list of topics mentioned was long and differed from group to group. (A complete list is available from the U.I. Center for Evaluation and Assessment.) One participant talked about how he gained a lot of advantages by being assertive or aggressive. He forced people to do what he wanted by being belligerent. A lot of people volunteered their opinions and participated in the discussion. When emotions were discussed in the second phase, participants talked about experiencing such emotions as:

- | | |
|---------------------|------------------|
| - Fear | - Inferiority |
| - Anger | - Superiority |
| - Frustration | - Desperation |
| - Confusion | - Impatience |
| - Embarrassment | - Feeling rushed |
| - Feeling belittled | - Insignificance |

The volunteers who staffed the stations, all native speakers of the second languages and many with personal immigrant or refugee experience, were also in the room. They shared their struggles as they tried to do their job in the simulation. For example, they described how they tried to communicate with the families, but eventually just gave up. Some officials expressed the sentiment that “It was their [the families] problem.”

For five minutes, the groups articulated their “supports,” or things that helped them get through the tasks. People discussed many topics, including: native-speakers, police officers, the signs above the stations, and other things that provided some degree of familiarity, including the fact that bureaucracies and their forms ask the same things all over the world.

Finally, a group leader asked participants to talk about how to apply their experiences from the simulation in their own classrooms. Participants mentioned things that they could do to help ELLs deal with the strangeness and disconnectedness of the “classroom in a second language” experience, including such things as:

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| - Build relationships with students | - Community networks |
| - Use of body language | - Support for staff |
| - Pictures | - Checklist of needed activities |
| - Physical support | - Student ambassadors |
| - Follow-through | - Attitude |
| - Language support | |

• Needs & Problems Addressed

The assumption of this activity was that participants did not understand what it is like to live in a foreign country, and to face the challenges of a culture that speaks a different language. The problem being addressed was participants’ lack of familiarity and/or empathy with the struggles of ELL students and families.

The participants attending this session were both the targets and the beneficiaries of this session. Also, the ELL students/families in the participants’ schools and school districts may benefit from this activity in that it was designed to increase participants’ empathy, which may lead to more effective interactions between ELLs and the participants.

• Immediate Outcomes Perceived by Observer

In the short term, the participants would be expected to leave with increased appreciation for the struggles of ELL students and their families. They should also have a mutual topic of discussion for the remaining days of the Summer Institute. The immediate outputs of the session included tasks completed, and various emotional states that the activity was designed to provoke. Charts created by the groups also provided evidence of these emotions, as did the strategies used by the groups to achieve their goals. Many of the experiences related to successes and failures in achieving fundamental human survival needs in a second language environment.

- Intermediate/Long-Term Outcomes

The long-term outcome of this session is that participants may be better equipped to understand, empathize with, and contextualize the needs of ELL students and their families, and be better able to respond to these groups. This may lead to increased access for those groups to educational resources and opportunities, and ultimately better learning and academic performance.

Some unintended outcomes may be that some participants inappropriately generalize their experience in the simulation to that of all immigrant families. One participant claimed it was easy to solve his problems by using force (the participant who reported acting in a belligerent manner), and this may not apply to people in real-world situations.

- Program Theory

The program theory of the session was that a large-scale simulation of the experiences shared by ELLs and their families would change the attitudes of the participants, provide additional context for the other Summer Institute sessions (charge participants with motivation and emotional meaningfulness), and help build a common bond among the participants. In addition, the simulation communicated that the goals of the Summer Institute were not just cognitive but also included emotional learning and skill.

James Crawford's Keynote Address *Education Policy and Language Politics: High Stakes for ELLs*

Another session on Monday was the keynote address on educational policy and the politics of language. Tapes, PowerPoint slides, or additional copies of materials may be available on the Our Kids Web Site by clicking on the Summer Institute button at the following URL: <http://www.state.ia.us/ourkids/index.html>.

- Context, Environment, & Participants

Approximately 100 to 150 people attended each of the three repetitions of this session. Many people, despite the length of the presentation, seemed to be attentive; however, approximately ten to fifteen percent of participants (as estimated by evaluation staff participant observers) were obviously not being attentive. Additional self-evaluations of engagement are reported in Sections 2 and 3. This session took place in a large auditorium with numerous participants and was, at times, difficult to hear as the microphone persistently went in and out. Also, many participants commented throughout the week that a break would have helped them pay better attention during this session. After an hour of presentation, the crowd appeared to be increasingly restless and a few people left the room. This continued throughout the presentation.

- Resources, Activities, & Procedures

James Crawford used a lecture format with PowerPoint slides to provide background on the policy issues relating to immigration and dual language programs. He expressed his aim to provide educational information by trying to debunk numerous myths. Via a two hour lecture, he aimed to educate participants on the following main points: 1) Language and American Nationalism, 2) English only—language in schools and local discretion, 3) English and the “Melting Pot,” 4) Language Attitudes and Myths—are current demographic trends a threat to the English language in America?, and 5) Is English acquisition slowing?

J. Crawford’s research myths included “Total Immersion is No Panacea,” conclusions made from Proposition 227 in California, issues regarding legislation that strives for equal educational opportunities, and reliability and validity issues involved when testing ELLs. Regarding the first point, total immersion, he discussed the critical period hypothesis (learning language at an early age is better); structured English immersion failure in states such as California, Arizona, and Massachusetts; academic English versus conversational English (takes four to seven years to become proficient); and the interdependence hypothesis as support for transfer of knowledge and skills. Second, regarding the use of test scores, he discussed Proposition 227 in California, an English only initiative in the classrooms, which attributed rising test scores to this proposition being approved and implemented. J. Crawford disputed this.

Third, he discussed various legislative striving for equal educational opportunity, including the 1968 Bilingual Education Act (funding to enable innovation); the 1974 ELL rights to language assistance, which stated students had to be treated differently sometimes to provide needed education; in 1981, the test for school districts in meeting obligations; and the 1994 Improving America’s Schools Act that created a priority for programs to cultivate bilingualism. These were followed by a focus of the 2002 No Child Left Behind act (NCLB). J. Crawford stated that NCLB provided just one approach, but that many questions still remained, including who is held accountable, accountable to whom, how is accountability measured, and rationales for maintaining an accountability system. He proposed that authentic accountability measures were needed, which took into account issues such as poverty, segregation in high poverty schools, resource inequities, shortages of bilingual and English as a Second Language (ESL) teachers, limited staff development, poorly designed programs, and opposition to research-based practices.

Next, J. Crawford educated participants on the importance of reliable and valid data. He provided a substantial background on research methods. He then discussed the importance of research-based methods and using research to back up policies (i.e., English immersion programs vs. dual language programs). Finally, he discussed dual language programs, pointing out that there are very few dual language programs. He discussed various issues and argued that assessment tests for ELLs are largely inaccurate and inadequate, neither valid nor reliable; ELLs are very diverse, making it difficult to set reasonable annual yearly progress (AYP) targets; and ELLs are an unstable subgroup, thus students will never approach 100% proficiency.

- Needs & Problems Addressed

This lecture addressed the lack of understanding or misperceptions that participants may have had about policies related to ELLs and language acquisition. It also provided a historical background and overview of the many cultural issues related to ELLs.

- Immediate Outcomes Perceived by Observers

Participants had the opportunity to hear information that could help them to better understand the political and cultural landscape relating to ELLs and their families. Since the lecture was two hours long, without a break, and because there were so many handouts and slides, participants may have experienced “information overload.” It may have been difficult in this setting to process so much information in such a short period of time. Additionally, because there was so

much information, it is difficult to say what specific new knowledge participants may have acquired. Each participant likely acquired some new knowledge, but it is hard to say what that new knowledge might be.

- Intermediate/Long-Term Outcomes

No specific strategies were provided for teachers to take and use in the classroom. This lecture likely increased teachers' declarative (factual) knowledge and may consequently provide some teachers with revised opinions or procedural arguments regarding the socio-cultural issues related to ELLs and their families. Teachers may also have acquired increased knowledge about language acquisition in an immersion setting vs. a dual language setting, research methods, and ELL testing procedures related to NCLB.

Participants' potential long-term outcomes may include improved knowledge of the following: research methods and how to distinguish quality research (or aware that not all research is quality), the myth of immersion programs as being universally effective, the importance of dual language programs, the lack of effective standardized measurement tools available to test ELLs. Participants may incorporate this knowledge into their lesson planning and classroom assessments.

- Program Theory

The evaluation team inferred that J. Crawford's program theory was to provide a lecture to participants that would increase knowledge about ELLs and dual language classrooms. This appeared to follow a model of directly presenting declarative (factual) knowledge through presentation of propositional (research) knowledge via lecturing and printed papers. A detailed scholarly paper was also made available to participants and is available either at <http://www.state.ia.us/ourkids/index.html> or by contacting the U.I. Center for Evaluation and Assessment.

A concern with the pedagogic approach of this session is that too little time and audience interaction was available for participants to "own" the information and to consider how to apply it to their own districts and ELL students. There may have been too much information at one setting to be incorporated into future practices without some opportunities for audience participation and applications.

Vinh Nguyen: *Parents and Community*

- Context, Environment, & Participants

There were approximately 100-150 people in each of the repetitions of this session. The room was set up with a large table in front and chairs where participants sat facing the four-member panel. The facilitator, Vinh Nguyen, stood in the center of the room with a microphone. V. Nguyen appeared jovial and seemed to capture participants' attention quickly. He immediately mentioned that he and his panel were from the Des Moines public schools and that their website was available to everyone as a resource. V. Nguyen used both a lecture format with a few PowerPoint slides and interactive activities that kept the audience attentive. The participants, with the exception of a few talkers in back, really seemed to enjoy this presentation. Everyone seemed to be attentive and interested in what was being said. There were also numerous questions toward the end of the session.

- Resources, Activities, & Procedures

V. Nguyen began with a PowerPoint presentation which discussed the acculturation process. The major topics included a discussion of the acculturation process, what it means to be a long-term visitor, descriptions of the migration experience, and the difference between a refugee and an immigrant. Approximately 20-25% of the audience believed they knew the difference between a refugee and an immigrant. Points discussed regarding the acculturation process included:

- Members of one cultural group adopt the beliefs and behaviors of another group—traditionally adopting languages and behaviors of the dominant group
- Deculturation—ethnocide
- Rejection—withdrawal or segregation
- Assimilation—melting pot
- Integration—multiculturalism
- Pluralism—mosaic

Next, V. Nguyen asked the panel members to tell their stories. One of the panel members was Laotian and he shared his story in Laotian for approximately five minutes. Only one woman indicated that she could understand what he was saying. V. Nguyen noted that the audience was listening very attentively because audience members could not understand what was being said. The Laotian man then explained in English that he had been forced out of his country during the Vietnam War. Some of his family members were killed and he was forced to come to the United States as a refugee.

The second person on the panel, a woman from Mexico, explained that her parents were immigrants, as opposed to refugees, and that her parents immigrated to the United States from Mexico, leaving her and her brother in Mexico. Once her parents could afford it, they sent for their two kids to come to the United States. She then explained how hard it was for her to attend school because she did not understand English. During her first few years of school in the United States, she “lived for” the ESL teacher and for math class—because she could understand and communicate in these classes. She also mentioned how hard it was, once she began to speak English, to translate for her parents in public settings—she felt ashamed of having to do this.

Third, a man from Sudan discussed his situation. He stated that he had been displaced to various countries, including Kenya, Ethiopia, and Egypt for approximately ten years while his country was at war. Since Egypt would not grant him political asylum, he became a refugee in the United States.

Lastly, a woman from Bosnia discussed how she applied to become a Bosnian refugee and come to the United States in the 1990s because her country was at war. Contributing to this decision was her fear that her husband and daughter would be hurt if they continued to live in Bosnia. She explained the importance of knowing exactly where you are headed. The United Nations told her she would be sent to Des Moines, Idaho. When they couldn’t find it on the map, her family was fearful because they couldn’t place where they were going. Finally, it was cleared up and they found Des Moines, Iowa on the map.

V. Nguyen presented and discussed a set of PowerPoint slides, again addressing the acculturation stages and factors that affect acculturation adjustment. Factors that affect acculturation include:

- Perceived social distance
- Cultural identity and affliction
- Language preference and use
- Social behavior orientation
- Social support network (family and community)
- Miscellaneous Factors (if younger it is easier to adapt, personality, and personal cultural awareness and competence)

This was followed by a discussion of acculturation stages, which are: discovery, disillusionment (home sick, defiant, identity crisis), adjustment (feeling less like an outsider),

recovery (beginning to realize the full impact of the situation, valuing the new culture, setting realistic goals for the future), and acceptance. Effects of acculturation can include a variety of things, including heightened anxiety, confusion, withdrawal, silence, distractibility, resistance to change, and stress. Finally, V. Nguyen gave participants a variety of things that teachers can do to help students through the acculturation process.

- Take time to learn student's background
 - Communicate with an attitude of unconditional acceptance
 - Encourage cultural knowledge sharing
 - Allow student to share knowledge & experience
 - Visit students' families
 - Ensure feelings of belonging
 - Ensure that success is being achieved (e.g., build an environment where ELL students can achieve—use small group instruction)
 - Effective teachers really think about their students' particular interior needs, rather than “what labels do my students have?”
 - What are students' strengths? And interests? Emphasize these to encourage involvement
- Needs & Problems Addressed

This lecture addressed the lack of knowledge or understanding that teachers may have had about ELLs, including: 1) diversity of backgrounds and experiences among ELLs and 2) the many challenges that exist for someone adjusting to American culture.

- Immediate Outcomes Perceived by Observer

The most important immediate outcome the evaluation team observed was the emotional connection participants felt toward the panel and the stories that were told. The diversity of stories told by the panel was powerful. Toward the end of the lecture, many participants seemed empathetic and interested in ways that schools and teachers can increase engagement of ELL students.

- Intermediate/Long-Term Outcomes

First, participants may have an increased understanding of immigrant and refugee experiences in the United States. In the long-term, this increased knowledge may lead participants to incorporate increased sensitivity into their classroom when working with ELL students and ELL students may feel more accepted and comfortable in their learning environment.

Second, as an intermediate outcome, participants may incorporate increased sensitivity into their classroom when working with ELL students and will develop strategies to deal with these challenges. In the long-term, this may lead ELL students to feel more accepted and comfortable in their learning environment.

Third, related to participants' immediate outcome of increased knowledge of strategies to get ELLs involved, participants may utilize strategies discussed during the session to involve ELL students in classroom and school activities (e.g., soccer, chess, or activities that may be familiar to the ELL students' native culture). In the long-term, ELL students may become more involved with school and classroom activities, increasing the chance of succeeding in school.

Fourth, related to participants' immediate outcome of increased understanding of the stages of cultural acquisition, participants may incorporate increased sensitivity into their classroom when working with ELL students. In the intermediate term, participants may have increased ability to identify “stages” of cultural acquisition, leading to a longer-term outcome that ELL students may feel more accepted and comfortable in their learning environment.

- Program Theory

The session first provided information via a direct lecture to increase participants' knowledge and awareness of issues regarding ELLs. A second component of the program theory was to have immigrants and refugees tell their stories to the audience. This part of the session appeared to be a powerful catalyst for participant learning because the diverse experiences and struggles of the panel resonated with participants emotionally. Consequently, the program theory seemed to connect the primary and secondary components—connecting theoretical/academic information from the PowerPoint slides to the real stories being told. This program theory seemed to be effective in connecting with and engaging the participants.

Tuesday, August 8, Teacher Candidates

Day Two began with registration and sign-in at 8 a.m., followed by an all day session on math from 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. with breaks for lunch and in the morning and afternoon. The session presenter and coordinator was Judy Kinley, whose session title was *Elementary Math*. Evaluation team members did not directly observe everything in this session because there were multiple strands beginning simultaneously, but we did interview participants during breaks to get their observations of session activities that we missed.

Judy Kinley: *Elementary Math*

- Context, Environment, & Participants

This session was the largest strand, consisting of approximately 150-200 people and including 17 TQE participants. Participants sat at round tables with six to eight people per table. Many materials were provided on each table including markers, construction paper, tape, pens, etc. The facilitator, Judy Kinley, stood at the front of the room with a lapel microphone so she could easily walk around. Two staff leaders were also in the room to provide any necessary assistance. J. Kinley used an overhead projector and had also placed a lot of posters around the room, demonstrating what could be used in classrooms. These posters were often graphs or visual math demonstrations. A large packet of handouts was given to participants entitled *Elementary Math/ELL*.

Overall, participants seemed engaged in this session; however, there were a large number of participants in this strand and not all participants were consistently engaged in the session. In an effort to collect further information on participant engagement, the evaluation team spoke briefly with a few participants who stated they would have preferred to have a choice of sessions because they don't teach math (they teach reading) and thought that this session was not applicable to them. The evaluation team could not determine from observation who the TQE teacher candidates were as opposed to the practicing teachers or how many actually attended the session; however, Section 2 provides additional information.

- Resources, Activities, & Procedures

Participants described to the evaluation team what they accomplished during the first morning session. The first thing participants did as they walked through the door in the morning was to take a sticker and place it on a Venn diagram to indicate whether they felt their expertise was ELL, math, or ELL and math. The left circle denoted math expertise, the right circle expertise with ELLs, and the middle section had both circles overlapping and indicated ELL and math expertise. Most people indicated that they were either ELL teachers or math teachers and

about 20-25% indicated that they were both math and ELL teachers. Once everyone had placed a sticker on this graph, the graph was hung on the wall for all to see.

Participants were also asked to indicate their comfort level in teaching math to ELLs. On a line graph, teachers placed a sticker to indicate their comfort level on a scale of “very comfortable” to “not at all comfortable.” Based on the stickers, most participants appeared to feel “somewhat comfortable” to “very comfortable.” J. Kinley then lectured for approximately 45 minutes. There were no handouts but the PowerPoint presentation is available on the Web site, <http://www.state.ia.us/ourkids/index.html>. After her lecture, she read the book *Chrysanthemum* and had participants work together at their tables to construct a graph.

During the latter half of the morning, which was observed by the evaluation team, J. Kinley read the book *Tiger Math* to the participants. This is a very short children’s book that incorporates math themes and visuals including line and bar graphs of a tiger’s height and weight. After reading the book, she asked all of the participants to make a graph of their own, at each table. She provided the temperature in Mexico City for the next ten days and each table subsequently graphed these temperatures. She indicated that this is an activity teachers could do with their classes. She also explained “making graphs” can be an informative test item. She then asked participants to write two reflections about the graph (this also could be done with students). The reflections consisted of identifying items such as the frequency of data points. For instance, one reflection was that “the temperature in Mexico City was 70 degrees three days out of ten.”

Next, J. Kinley asked participants to make a circle graph out of five data points she had posted on the overhead projector. The data points were votes for “Favorite Iowa State Fair Food” (funnel cakes-6, turkey legs-1, deep fried Twinkies-3, and snow cones-2). Teachers then worked with others at the table to make a circle graph.

She discussed effective math classrooms and stated that effective classrooms must expose children to all different kinds of problems, allow children to talk about strategies using math, and allow them to practice. Just memorizing will not help them. She then indicated that one of the following should be done everyday (also listed in the handout):

- | | |
|--|-------------------------------|
| - Routines – building problem solving skills | - Routine problem solving |
| - Calendar math | - Non-routine problem solving |
| - Maintenance math | - Graphing |
| - Mental math | - Standardized test practice |
| - Hundreds board activities | - Fact strategies review |

Additionally, math classrooms should include visual components:

- Concept/word wall – words with illustrations to represent math ideas (e.g., counting)
- Number line
- Hundreds chart
- Calendar math—activities including patterns, money & time
- Graphs & charts
- Visuals

Additional math strategies discussed by the facilitator included logic posters and non-routine problem solving strategies. Details are provided on both of these topics:

A. Logic Posters – Problem solving steps

1. What is the question? (Especially hard for ELLs to answer, so teachers may want to ask this last) Cover up numbers when asking the question and see what words they don’t know.
2. Often do not get to the question until the end—organized differently than, for example, the main point in reading
3. What are the facts?
4. Plan how to solve it
5. Solve the problem
6. Check your answer

B. Non-Routine Problem Solving Strategies

1. Act it out

2. Draw a picture
3. Guess & check
4. Make an organized list
5. Make a table
6. Work backwards
7. Eliminate extra information
8. Solve a simpler problem
9. Use logical reasoning

During the 45-minute afternoon observation, which started at 3:00 p.m., participants discussed the need to look for opportunities to provide more mathematical experiences for ELL students. One participant suggested a family math night - anything to increase student engagement in math. Another suggestion was to utilize “math games.” J. Kinley then handed out approximately eight math games to each table for participants to work with. Participants seemed relatively engaged by these games and seemed to appreciate having an activity for ELL students that did not involve a lot of language.

- Needs & Problems Addressed

This session specifically addressed any lack of skill or strategies that elementary teachers may have teaching math to ELLs.

- Immediate Outcomes Perceived by Observer

The primary outcome gained of this session was to inform participants of practical strategies to use with ELL students. The session did not focus on a lot of theoretical information, but rather provided basic activities that could be used with ELL students. Participants gained strategies via verbal instructions about how to teach math to ELLs but also had time to try out and complete the strategies or activities themselves.

- Intermediate/Long-Term Outcomes

Teachers may use strategies learned in this session in their classrooms. In the long-term, ELL students may respond to these strategies to increase their achievement in math classes.

- Program Theory

The program theory focused primarily on participant interaction, as J. Kinley allowed participants to learn strategies by actually completing them. There was limited lecture (except for the first 45 minutes) and participants spent a lot of time working with specific strategies. The evaluation team inferred that having participants complete the strategies themselves will increase the probability that participants will remember them and better determine what may or may not work in their classroom. Participant attention and engagement might have been lessened if the material had all been presented via lecture format and demonstration without application.

Tuesday, August 8, Teacher Educators

Day Two for the teacher educators also began with registration and sign in at 8:00 a.m., followed by a session from 8:30 a.m. until 3:30 p.m. with Kathleen Bailey on *Teacher Training*. From 3:30 p.m. to 4:30 p.m., Norma Hernandez led a session on *Funding Resources*.

Kathleen Bailey: *Teacher Training*

- Context, Environment, & Participants

All of Kathleen Baileys' sessions took place in a small room with five tables of 35 people, grouped with six to eight people per table. She stood at the front of the room with PowerPoint slides, a chalkboard, and a large pad of white paper. The teacher educators appeared to be sitting with colleagues from their institutions. Throughout the presentation, participants were occasionally distracted by sounds from the room next door, which was separated by a plastic divider.

The session goals were listed in a handout and included the following:

1. Getting to know you and your students.
2. Goal setting for the workshop.
3. What's it like to learn a language?
4. What's it like to learn in a language?
5. Implications for teacher education.

The morning session (8:30 to 10:30 a.m.) goals included an icebreaker activity that addressed two issues: (1) Getting to know you and your students, and (2) Goal setting for the workshop. The idea was that participants would get to know each other and would identify their needs and what they hope to gain from the Summer Institute. Second, there was a Shock Language Demonstration that asked two questions: (1) What is it like to learn a language, and (2) What is it like to learn in a language? Participants were taught Korean for 15 minutes and during this time were spoken to only in Korean.

- Resources, Activities, & Procedures

The session began with a few miscellaneous announcements including a brief discussion about expenses and stipends. Additionally, Karen Nichols, the Project Coordinator, spoke to the group to inform them that all educators would be contacted in the fall regarding the TQE Program, specifically to inquire about how educators may be changing methods courses to improve teacher quality and education. She suggested participants complete the action plan they received in their registration bag.

K. Bailey then introduced an 'icebreaker' activity. She assigned table monitors and then asked each participant to fill out a yellow file card with the following information: name, place of work, and a description of their students. The cards were collected and then mixed up and distributed to each participant, with K. Bailey attempting to ensure that they did not know the person on the card. Each person was then to ask the person whose card they received the following questions: (1) What specific language(s) do you speak besides English, and (2) What specific skills, knowledge and resources would s/he like to learn today?

Everyone moved through the room for approximately 15 minutes to complete the activity. After the participants had discussed their answers, she instructed everyone to return to their chairs. She then told everyone to stand up one by one, introduce the person they talked with, explain who they are and how they answered their questions. Below is a summary of those answers:

Institutions represented:

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|
| - Dordt | - Upper Iowa |
| - William Penn | - Iowa State |
| - University of Northern Iowa (UNI) | - Simpson |

Languages spoken (not necessarily fluently) besides English (all were native English speakers):

- | | |
|-----------------|-----------|
| - German | - Arabic |
| - French | - Spanish |
| - Egyptian | - Hebrew |
| - Russian | - Greek |
| - Sign language | |

What specific skills, knowledge and resources would he/she like to acquire today?

- | | |
|--|--|
| - Networking | - How to incorporate techniques for teaching ELLs |
| - Ideas for methods classes | - What are the needs of ELL students |
| - Things that will help students prepare for classes | - How to prepare students to work with changing demographics |
| - Things that will help with undergraduate teachers | - Ways to help students think outside the box |
| - What to integrate into math classes | - How to generate empathy for all students |
| - Ways to introduce ESL in reading programs | |
| - How to better prepare teacher candidates to teach ELL students | |
| - Modeling of effective teaching practices | |

Next, K. Bailey informed the participants that they would need to remember everyone's names. She posed the question: "How does your listening change when you know you have an assignment?" She emphasized that much of class learning depends on the purpose of the teacher and how the teacher focuses the class. She pointed out that attention increases when students have an assignment.

She continued to discuss lessons learned from this quick "needs assessment" activity. She indicated this activity was a strategy that could be used with ELL students to determine their English speaking skill levels. In addition to learning students' names and backgrounds, teachers could determine the level of ELLs speaking, including grammar, pronunciation, and vocabulary skills. For instance, it is possible to distinguish higher skilled English language speakers based on their use of the word "like". A student who states "he likes candy," probably has higher language skills than a student who states, "he like candy".

Next was the Shock Language Demonstration, which taught the Korean language to participants by speaking only Korean. Prior to the 'shock language demonstration,' K. Bailey gave a thinking assignment, which asked each participant to write a one paragraph description of either: 1) your typical student or 2) the kind of student you are worried about. She came back to this paragraph later in the day.

Next, she began to speak only in Korean, which caught the participants off guard. For example, she would say a phrase in Korean and gesture for the participants to say it back to her. Most of the participants struggled because the language and pronunciation in Korean is so different from English. She asked each individual participant to speak the phrase back to her; the participants completed this task with varying success. The activity continued for less than five minutes, when most participants were able to repeat it correctly.

She then began to point to males and females while saying two new words. Participants associated these two new words with man and woman. Next, she changed her intonation from a high to a low sound, while simultaneously pointing to males and females. Participants guessed that the intonation indicated a masculine or feminine word. She followed this by drawing pictures of a house and car on the chalkboard. She introduced two new words, pointing to the pictures to indicate the words' meaning, again followed with participants verbalizing each new word.

After 15 minutes of this cycle of instruction, each participant wrote responses to the following questions: 1) how do you feel right now (after the Shock Language demonstration), and 2) what do you know about the language?

The participants debriefed with a large group discussion led by K. Bailey. Participants responded to the first question, regarding their feelings following the demonstration, as follows:

- Excited
- Overwhelmed
- Frustrated
- Curious
- Challenged by learning verbally without seeing the written word
- Eager to learn more
- Motivated to use this powerful tool (activity) to demonstrate to students how difficult learning in a second language actually is
- Fear became an issue—there was fear of having to speak aloud because some people were able to get the language so quickly
- Searching for cognates was fruitless because the language was so different
- Tried unsuccessfully to relate to prior knowledge; when you are able to relate to a language (via cognates etc.) it really works for you and when you are not, it really works against you
- Already forgetful of what was learned
- Annoyed and/or angry not to know the language
- Not having confidence as a learner

Participants responded to the second question, which asked what they knew about the language following the demonstration, as follows:

- Most people knew house and car
- Many had questions about what the rising intonation meant
- Many were confused because Korean is an SOV (subject, object, verb) language
- There is a difference between conversation and learning, between conversation and academic language
- Repetition really helps to remember and to acquire the language
- Teacher affirmation is very important in such a difficult, uncomfortable environment

During the afternoon session, from 1:00 until 2:30 p.m., K. Bailey began by asking participants to provide reflective thoughts from the morning activities. In addition, she asked participants to provide the evaluation team with an overview of what occurred during the previous session. The participants in this session said they had discussed a “content-based instruction” model called the “6 Ts.” The “6 Ts” is a framework that was developed to teach teachers how to work with ELLs and includes the following:

- Themes – central ideas
- Topics – sub-units under themes
- Threads – tie themes together
- Text – many things, graphic, visual, etc.
- Task-activities – there may be different levels of proficiency
- Transitions – technical and tasks

Additional reflections about the material learned in the morning included the following:

- The facilitator was not a giver of knowledge (allowed knowledge to be learned by creating it individually or with the group).
- Two participants had questions, including “What is being indicated to the learner in this session,” “What is the broad application of the ideas,” and “How can they be applied in the classroom when working with teacher candidates?”

K. Bailey responded to the questions by moving on to the next activity, which was a classroom application of the morning session’s knowledge. She used the overhead projector to display a theoretical/conceptual model by Rod Ellis, called the *Ellis Model of Training Activities*. Instead of lecturing on this model, she instructed participants to ask her ‘yes’ or ‘no’ questions, which she believed allowed participants to take responsibility for their own learning. She indicated the following about the *Ellis Model* prior to the questioning:

- The model corresponds to ELL materials for use in classroom teaching
- Tasks are likely to be based on the same data and constitute the raw material of the activities
- Each activity will give the trainee a number of tasks to perform

Participants posed the following questions. K. Bailey's responses are enclosed in the parenthetical following each question:

- Is there a reflective piece to this model? (no, but there should be)
- Does formative, summative, & implementation data inform data and/or drive the choice of activities? (both)
- Can this model be adapted without violating its integrity? (yes)
- Does the arrow (for "experiential" and "awareness-raising") mean it works both ways? ("awareness-raising" and "experiential" are not mutually exclusive)
- Can this model (in practice) take place in the same setting? (sometimes)
- What is missing under "teaching practice?" (language learning, which many of us lack)

Participants next began to ask "how" & "why" questions as she explained that yes/no questions, although an important early step, rely on lower-ordered cognitive processes. She suggested these additions to the *Ellis Model*:

- Language learning
- Peer teaching (more effective with students teaching foreign language)
- Student teaching

At the request of participants, K. Bailey also defined how the model used "Tasks" and "Data." Tasks referred to activities such as "ranking," "listing," or "summarizing." Data referred to what teacher candidates learned from texts, student papers, test results, speech samples, video transcripts, lesson plans, case studies, etc.

Essentially the model stated that activities combined with procedures provide comprehensive teacher training. Before the development of the *Ellis Model*, teacher training consisted of many lectures, providing only limited "awareness-raising."

Next, K. Bailey asked, "where does the reflective piece belong?" She responded herself, explaining: "Reflection is where professional development happens -- where it comes into play in the actual teaching component." She also explained the model was powerful in that it demonstrated that teachers can change teaching strategies by changing the data & the procedures used.

She returned to participants the information cards they completed during the morning session and requested that participants pair up and share goals with someone they did not know. Participants were instructed to discuss their goals first, then how these goals were or were not met, and then topics that were learned during the session.

Following this small-group discussion, participants debriefed with a full-group discussion. This discussion eventually turned to issues relating to ELLs and teacher candidates, including the implications of the session for teacher education. The topics were as follows:

- Lack of human resources is becoming a concern
- How to use students to help with teaching
- Supporting goal acquisition indirectly
- Teacher candidates that were educated with one population of students will not go into that same population; some will teach in a totally different populations
- School psychologists available to help with ELL assessment—getting them involved with this session is a good step in the right direction
- Awareness of increasing numbers of ELLs entering school districts
- Differentiation has to be the norm, not the exception—a new awareness of the challenge
- Developing empathy—how to teach empathy?
- Have students add a language learning objective—incorporate them into lesson planning

- Needs & Problems Addressed

One key problem complex is the uncertainty and challenges of training teacher candidates to be prepared to teach diverse populations of ELL students. Additionally, how can teacher educators best train teacher candidates to be prepared to teach diverse populations of ELL students?

This session also provided participants with an opportunity to better understand who they were as a group and who was participating in the TQE program. Additionally, K. Bailey's activity provided participants with an understanding of what each person hopes to learn while simultaneously demonstrating a needs assessment activity that can be easily illustrated to teacher candidates.

Finally, any lack of understanding that may have existed among these educators about the challenges of learning another language and the challenges of learning in another language was addressed by the Shock Language demonstration.

- Immediate Outcomes Perceived by Observer

First, participants gained an increased understanding of other participants' backgrounds and interests in the Summer Institute. Second, participants acquired strategies that could be used either directly with ELL students or that could be taught to teacher candidates who will be working with ELL students (e.g., Shock Language demonstration). Third, participants gained an increased understanding of how difficult it is to learn *in* another language. Fourth, participants were provided with a strategy for how to provide teacher candidates with an understanding of the challenges of learning in another language and learning another language. And finally, participants gained an improved understanding of a teaching model (*Ellis Model*) that incorporates "experiential" and "awareness-raising" elements and "learning by doing" (however, the evaluation team observer did not get the sense that this concept was new to participants as they seemed relatively comfortable and familiar with the concept).

- Intermediate/Long-Term Outcomes

Teacher educators may utilize the *Ellis Model* and related strategies (such as the Shock Language demonstration) with teacher candidates. This would lead teacher candidates to experience the challenges of having to learn a new language in that language and teacher candidates' awareness and their understanding about ELLs and related issues will increase. Implementation by teacher educators of the *Ellis Model* and related strategies may also lead teacher candidates to bring increased understanding and empathy into their schools and classrooms. This may help teacher candidates increase ELLs' success and achievement.

- Program Theory

K. Bailey's program theory is to "learn by doing." She mentioned in her sessions that she does not want to be the "giver of knowledge," she wants participants to create and develop the knowledge themselves. This was apparent in each of her activities, which required participants to be engaged in their learning. The knowledge that the teacher educators gained and the way in which they gained this knowledge can be better transferred to students because the teacher educators have experienced Ellis' "experiential" and "awareness raising" learning process. The evaluation team inferred that K. Bailey thought this process would allow the teacher educators to learn more than if they simply listened to her lecture.

Norma Hernandez: *Funding Resources*

- Context, Environment, & Participants

The context, environment, and participants did not change from the morning session. The only change was a new presenter, Norma Hernandez, who used PowerPoint slides.

- Resources, Activities, & Procedures

N. Hernandez, who is from International Educational Consultants, an organization based in Baton Rouge, as listed on the handout, presented ways to locate funding resources and tips for grant-writing and putting together quality applications. She also handed out a thick black folder with the PowerPoint slides and a list of funding agencies. Essentially, she stated that a grant writer needs to write a program that satisfies both program needs and the funding agencies' requests. Additionally, she informed participants that federal money is available and abundant. To access it, one must just determine how best to present and meet the needs of the program and the funding agencies. N. Hernandez used William Penn University as an example because it received two teacher training grants, which are usually awarded to larger universities. She also mentioned that grants are not meant to be the "bread and butter," the primary support, but rather the "whipped cream" or the wish list that you feel you cannot have but need. The program does not have to result in a degree but it does have to be something that will improve teaching, possibly improving part of the program to improve teacher quality.

- Needs & Problems Addressed

This session targeted any teacher educators who were not aware of how to locate and acquire funding and provided them with some essential tools and tips.

- Immediate Outcomes Perceived by Observer

Teacher educators gained knowledge about how to locate and obtain funding sources.

- Intermediate/Long-Term Outcomes

Teacher educators will use the knowledge they gained at this session to locate and obtain funding sources via grant-writing; teacher educators will receive funding to improve teacher quality efforts; funding resources toward improving teacher quality efforts will lead teacher candidates to become more effective teachers.

- Program Theory

The program theory for this session was to provide education about funding resources and grant-writing to participants through lecturing and using PowerPoint slides.

Wednesday, August 9, Teacher Candidates

The Wednesday session began with registration and sign in from 8:00 to 8:30 a.m., followed by Linda Franco's session which lasted most of the day. One hour consisted of a presentation by Mario Sosa (3:30 to 4:30 p.m.).

Lynda Franco: *What's Different About Teaching Reading to ELLs?*

- Context, Environment, & Participants

Similar to Tuesday, this session occurred in a large room with approximately 190 participants (both Our Kids and TQE candidates) sitting at tables of six to eight people. For the most part, participants seemed engaged by this session. L. Franco brought a lot of both theoretical and practical information. The practical information, such as strategies that can be used in the classroom, appeared to be particularly important to the participants and kept participant engagement high throughout the latter part of the afternoon.

- Resources, Activities, & Procedures

L. Franco handed out a large, bound booklet with approximately 100 pages of handouts. She referenced this booklet throughout her presentation. She stated that according to No Child Left Behind regulations, there are five components of an effective reading program:

1. phonemic awareness
2. phonics
3. fluency
4. comprehension
5. vocabulary development

L. Franco then discussed four rules she uses in her classroom:

1. No one can shout an answer aloud or raise their hands
2. She requires that students work in groups
3. No one person chooses who will answer for the group—everyone has to be prepared to know the answer because they may get called on to answer
4. If one person does not know the answer then the entire group is held responsible

These rules require that everyone in the group communicates. If followed, they will ensure that ELL students communicate and that native English speakers communicate with ELL students. The rules require students to work through the language barrier and in turn will help ELL students with language acquisition.

L. Franco then taught participants a song in Spanish. After the song, she asked what had happened in each group to understand the song. Participants responded that they had used other ways to communicate the song's meaning, including visuals like photographs, pictures, *realia* (or concrete objects and materials), and a graphic organizer. L. Franco then referred participants to their handouts to review specific strategies.

Next, L. Franco presented a brief PowerPoint presentation on teaching vocabulary to ELLs. She discussed the brain research that supports or does not support current teaching strategies. She first discussed the standard strategy of teaching vocabulary to students, which involves giving them words and their definitions, having the student memorize them, and then administering a quiz a few days later. L. Franco proposed that this is an ineffective way to teach vocabulary because students tend to forget the vocabulary words in the long-term. The best way to teach vocabulary, she believed, is based on brain research and provides students with a real, tangible definition of a word. So, if the word is 'apple,' provide students with an apple to look at and feel. The following is a hierarchical list of what the brain perceives as real and useful for remembering words (in order of what will most help students remember vocabulary words to what will help least):

1. Use the real thing—so if it is an 'apple' bring in an apple
2. If you cannot bring in the real thing (e. g., if the vocabulary word is "bulldozer") the next best thing is to bring in a 3-dimensional replica that is reduced in size.
3. Colored photographs (color, context, size relationship—a picture dictionary is very helpful)

4. Colored pictures (that should show color, context, size relationship, what it does and what it does in relationships to other things)
5. Black & White pictures (e.g., worksheets)
6. Flashcards (there is no context to meaning)

Other tools for helping ELL students with vocabulary include demonstrations, gestures, and repetition. She noted that teachers needed to be especially careful with different cultural meanings that may exist. According to various research studies, a child needs to hear a word 40-60 times in order for it to become part of the active vocabulary.

L. Franco then discussed the need to begin with the oral and aural part of learning a language. She suggested teachers not start with reading and writing first—but rather with kinesthetic, visual, and auditory activities. Additionally, she stated teachers should not speak slowly and loudly but rather with logical pauses that take place in logical places to allow ELLs time to make connections between words. Referring to the handout on page 49 of the booklet, L. Franco emphasized teachers providing ELL students more opportunities to practice the structured curriculum they have learned. According to the handout, practice activities increase comprehensibility, interaction, and thinking skills, issues the session proceeded to focus on for the rest of the day.

- Needs & Problems Addressed

This session specifically addressed any lack of skill or strategies that elementary teachers may have teaching reading and/or vocabulary to ELLs.

- Immediate Outcomes Perceived by Observer

Participants seemed engaged and excited about the new strategies learned. As a result, the immediate outcomes appeared to be increased knowledge and increased engagement in teaching vocabulary to ELLs.

- Intermediate/Long-Term Outcomes

Teachers will use strategies discussed above (including repetition of vocabulary, visuals, talking with logical pauses, and realia) in the classroom to teach vocabulary. ELL students will increase their vocabulary and improve their reading in English. A long-term outcome would be that ELL students may be more likely to succeed academically if these strategies are implemented by participants.

- Program Theory

For the most part, participants seemed engaged in this session. L. Franco presented a balance of theoretical and practical information. The practical information, such as classroom strategies, was important to the participants and seemed to keep them engaged throughout the latter part of the afternoon. L. Franco's program theory was to deliver a direct lecture with PowerPoint slides in order to increase participants' knowledge about theoretical and practical issues related to teaching ELLs reading and vocabulary. She then used interactive discussion and practical application activities to help participants further process their new knowledge and increase their understanding. Her own learning theory for ELLs as described in her presentations and guided activities was mirrored and applied to the learning activities for Institute participants.

Mario Sosa: *Confessions of a Multicultural Music Teacher*

- Context, Environment, & Participants

This was a one-hour presentation. Mario Sosa was introduced as a promising music teacher who had taught music all over the world. Before starting his presentation, he asked people to clear the table and put everything underneath.

- Resources, Activities, & Procedures

M. Sosa used PowerPoint slides during his presentation. First, he stated the purpose of the presentation: to share what he experienced while teaching music abroad and how various cultural influences are reflected in his teaching. He played a video, in which a group of people were singing and dancing in a foreign language. The participants listened carefully for a few minutes. Then he projected a slide with questions, shown below, written on it. Participants' responses to these questions and the evaluation team's observations are included in the parenthetical information.

1. What is the song about? (One participant answered the question correctly because he understood the language.)
2. What is the singer's culture? (There were more responses and different answers.)
3. How does the song relate with other things? (The participants talked with each other and laughed while they are guessing the answer. Some of them pointed out that it was hard to tell because they did not know the language. They could only guess from the information the video shows.)

M. Sosa agreed with the participants' responses and shared some anecdotes. He said he was going to show three countries with their own unique cultures. There were nine PowerPoint slides used to introduce the first country, as detailed below.

- Slide 1, a picture of Curacao (Korsou): He asked about the architecture presented. Some teachers could figure out the features of the architecture and answered that it was Dutch.
- Slide 2, a map of Korsou: By showing the geographic location, M. Sosa introduced the rarely-known country.
- Slide 3, some statistical information about the country: population, life expenses, literacy, etc.
- Slide 4, some ethnic groups that are quite diverse
- Slide 5, religions and languages, presented too quickly to record
- Slide 6, pictures of kids playing strings/violins: he reports that they were from 4 different ethnic groups.
- Slide 7, schools: he let the teachers guess the length of the school day for the country. No one could answer correctly. He pointed out that the daily school hours are 7:30 a.m. until 12:30 p.m. and the yearly break is 70 days due to the country's location and hot climate.
- Slide 8, about how to teach music theories and music terms: He said it was easier to show the kids how to practice playing, but when it came to theories, it was a different story. Cultural issues played an important role.
- Slide 9 presented the question: What did I learn? He commented a little about his experience in this little island country. The teachers talked with each other and nodded.

Next, M. Sosa used five slides to introduce the second country.

- Slide 1, a picture of Haiti: He asked the teachers about their knowledge of this country. The teachers seemed to be more familiar with this country. Some responded actively.
- Slide 2, a map and location of Haiti
- Slide 3, statistical information: When informed, the teachers were astonished by its large population and its poverty
- Slide 4, language

- Slide 5, picture of a string program

M. Sosa used a series of slides to introduce a third country, New Zealand. He pointed out that this country was different from the above two. It was much richer. He asked whether the teachers could identify the people in the pictures. Most of the teachers responded “Maoli”. The teachers could recognize the people by the body language and facial expressions from the picture. M. Sosa continued to show some slides based on newspaper articles about *Maolis*. He also showed slides of maps, religions, statistical information, ethnic composition of a college, and languages. The teachers were astonished by the number of sheep in New Zealand, 45 million, which is much more than the number of people, 4 million.

M. Sosa described the cultural shock he experienced there. The participants appeared to be captured by the anecdotes. Finally, he commented that the above three countries share a common feature—cultural diversity. He said the teachers should be well aware of the cultures they are in to enhance their teaching. There were no questions from the teachers. People applauded for his presentation.

- Needs & Problems Addressed

Participants might only focus on the specific teaching strategies and remain unaware of the cultural differences among ELLs.

- Immediate Outcomes Perceived by Observer

Participants appeared to become more aware of the cultural differences among the students. They related selected diversity issues to their teaching.

- Intermediate/Long-Term Outcomes

Increased cultural awareness among the participants will make teaching more effective in increasing ELLs’ academic skill.

- Program Theory

The presentation used a visual/auditory (multi-media) presentational format. By presenting his own experience in teaching music to students from diverse cultures, M. Sosa intended to increase the participants’ cultural awareness as related to their teaching.

Wednesday, August 9, Teacher Educators

The Wednesday session for teacher educators began with registration and sign-in from 8:00 to 8:30 a.m., followed by Mario Sosa’s session entitled *A Recent Graduate’s Perspective* from 8:30-9:30 a.m. Following Mario Sosa, Mary Schleppegrell’s session *Academic Language* took place from 9:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. The extensively planned and much anticipated Cultural Expo scheduled for 4:30 to 9:30 p.m. was cancelled, reportedly because it was viewed as entertainment by some of the officials at the Iowa Department of Education, who would not allow it to go forward. The decision was later rescinded but not in time to implement the Cultural Expo.

Mario Sosa: *A Recent Graduate’s Perspective*

- Context, Environment, & Participants

There were approximately 30 people in attendance, which were considerably fewer people than on Tuesday. The tables were set up in a similar fashion to Tuesday's sessions.

- Resources, Activities, & Procedures

M. Sosa delivered a PowerPoint slide presentation during his hour-long session. He first discussed his presentation philosophy, which he felt enhanced the learning experience. This philosophy was as follows: 1) share different experiences, 2) be free of all judgments, 3) answer the question, "what have I learned about myself that is new," and 4) inquire whether the audience can see the relationship between all things.

He stated that he encouraged "active thinking." He played a song for approximately one minute and then asked participants questions about it. The song had a man singing in another language and it was upbeat with a lot of drums. He asked, "What is this song about?" (It was about 9/11.) "Can this song tell you anything about the singer's culture from listening to the song?" (People are happy, speaking out against 9/11). Then he asked, "What can you tell me about the culture?" (People express themselves in rhythm, are aware of the world and current events, are interested in politics, and are sympathetic). M. Sosa was attempting to demonstrate that there are universal elements to all cultures that can be expressed via music.

He then began to discuss Curacao, a small island in the Caribbean where he taught music. He provided demographic information about the country including that it was colonized by the Dutch, many young people leave for larger cities, and that there are 4 major languages including Papiamentu, a Creole language combining Dutch and Portuguese. He then discussed his experience having to speak English (his native language), Dutch (required national language), and Papiamentu (what most of the kids spoke) in order to teach music.

He demonstrated how to teach music without language using a volunteer in the audience. He taught this participant to play the violin—which is not difficult to do using gestures and mimicking. He emphasized that it is difficult to teach theory (such as reading notes or what specific symbols mean) and relatively easy to teach the actual movements of how to play an instrument. He used a PowerPoint slide to show a sample worksheet that he had used in the classroom and demonstrated how he had taught theory in numerous languages. The worksheet provided definitions of various words in Dutch, English, and Papiamentu.

- Needs & Problems Addressed

This session addressed the lack of understanding teacher educators may have had about other cultures and their issues with schools and language barriers. Participants might only focus on the appropriate teaching strategies but remain unaware of the cultural differences among ELLs. Aside from identifying this need, the evaluation staff member was unclear as to the purpose of this presentation and what specific needs and/or problems it addressed. It was unclear to the staff member how it related specifically to the TQE teacher educator strand.

- Immediate Outcomes Perceived by Observer

First, participants have an increased understanding and knowledge of diverse cultures. Second, participants have an increased understanding and awareness that similar issues (such as language barriers in school systems) exist in other cultures. Finally, participants have an increased understanding that music, art, math, science etc. exist in many cultures and can be taught despite language barriers.

- Intermediate/Long-Term Outcomes

First, participants may have increased engagement in classrooms to work with and to teach ELL students. Second, participants may have an increased cultural awareness in teaching, increasing the effectiveness of teaching reading to ELLs.

- Program Theory

M. Sosa used visual and auditory (multimedia) presentational format via PowerPoint slides and shared personal experiences to deliver information to participants. By presenting his experiences with teaching music to students from diverse cultures, M. Sosa illustrated the effects of culture on teaching. The program theory of this presentation was to increase knowledge of participants through a direct lecture using PowerPoint slides and additional media such as photographs and music. There were minimal activities in which the entire audience participated; however, there was a lot of presenter interaction with the audience, including a few brief discussions.

Mary Schleppegrell: *Academic Language*

- Context, Environment, & Participants

There were approximately 35 participants who attended this session, more than in the morning session. The tables were set up in a similar fashion to Tuesday's sessions. Although the facilitator's style was more low-key and quiet than yesterday, the participants seemed very engaged and interested in what she had to say. This was possibly, in part, because she appeared to have a lot of knowledge and experience to offer participants. Noise from the room next door was distracting at times.

- Resources, Activities, and Procedures

M. Schleppegrell began by stating that ELL students need academic language in addition to social language. Although social language is the easier to acquire, ELL students will not fully achieve if they do not also have academic language skills. This goes beyond general literacy strategies.

M. Schleppegrell next went through her PowerPoint slides and discussed them briefly. She discussed the definition of functional grammar: 1) analyzing meaning in context, 2) focusing on language choices, and 3) using grammar to extrapolate meaning. In other words, functional grammar is seeing how the content itself is made up of language.

There are three kinds of specialized meaning in every text:

- Ideational meaning—what the text is about; displaying knowledge in different subjects
- Interpersonal meaning—the “voice” it presents; being authoritative; its relational meaning
- Textual meaning—how language is organized; structuring texts in valued ways

This is an approach to grammar that works in big, meaningful chunks. It is important for students to be able to identify different patterns in texts to understand what is happening in each text.

Additional text elements to identify include:

- Identifying themes: identifying words before the verbs
- Analyzing theme: does the text indicate change? A logical connection? Does it enable the writer to put new information later in the clause?
- Verb groups present different processes and noun groups present different participants

After M. Schleppegrell presented the brief lecture described above, she asked participants to work together in pairs with the example texts she provided to 1) identify themes of one of the

subject area texts, 2) discuss types of themes and how they contribute to the flow of the text, and 3) recognize the meanings presented in the themes and how they contribute to the logical development of the text. All of the participants seemed to be engaged in the activity, although it appeared to be a particularly challenging activity. M. Schleppegrell went around to each table to talk with the groups.

During the activity debriefing, participants expressed the following reactions:

- So many “new participants” (i.e., nouns) kept being introduced in the math text
- It became clear that transitions in texts would be really difficult for ELLs—spending some time with the text is important.

The participants wrote their answers, for each analyzed text, on poster paper that was hung up all around the room. They then discussed each poster. Below is a brief summary of that discussion:

- Kate Shelley Text
 - o Narrative text will have introductory phrases with time and place
 - o Clause will shift the texts
 - o Points out that the text is organized in a specific way
- How would you use this with a group of learners?
 - o Need to use this repetitiously with students; can do certain things with this—it’s all about knowing certain things about language that you can use
 - o Gifted and talented students really appreciate it and you can slow the reading down for less proficient students—a good exercise for all types of students
 - o Teachers will also start to see patterns—things that are really difficult to pick up on for ELLs (e.g., “a” or “the”—often students don’t know which to use)

M. Schleppegrell presented a brief lecture after the survey, again using PowerPoint slides. She mentioned that history texts are often difficult for ELL students because in order to understand the context you need to have a lot of background knowledge. She then handed out a history text (from an 8th grade history textbook) about the Declaration of Independence. M. Schleppegrell asked that people again work in pairs to analyze this text (based on what they have learned this morning) and review how academic usage of words can be different from social usage.

During the activity debriefing, one participant mentioned that she had stayed behind during the break to analyze one of the science texts which used a lot of action texts to process rather than defining and describing. Science has a particular pattern that requires a lot of active verbs to make the text flow—more action verbs versus being verbs. In regard to the history text, there was also a lot of action, in terms of who is doing what and who is thinking and saying certain things. Additionally, the “characters” in the text are represented as “knowers” and “sayers.”

During the afternoon session, from 3:00 until 4:30 p.m., M. Schleppegrell gave a brief lecture with slides addressing how focusing on language can be a way to teach content—developing content-based instruction. She used genre writing and grammar to relate to what was being discussed in the classroom.

At 3:30 p.m., M. Schleppegrell asked participants to return to the texts they worked with in the morning to determine the genre of the text and whether the genre of the text in their fields could be taught in this way. The participants seemed engaged. M. Schleppegrell stopped by numerous tables to see how people were doing. Many used example math or science texts, and the large-group discussion focused on these texts once people had finished the activity.

Once the discussion was over, some participants indicated that this was a time consuming but constructive activity. Participants thought it was effective. M. Schleppegrell then mentioned that her research group has conducted research in this area and determined that students who went through this “program” have had higher achievement on standardized tests than students who had not gone through the program. In addition, she and her research team conducted a study, which is

about to be published, coming to the same conclusion. She summarized by saying that this is the type of literacy that is critical and that is the most satisfying.

The last half hour was spent in a discussion about how much of this information pre-service teachers can absorb. M. Schleppegrell believed teacher candidates could absorb this information. She has taught classes at the University of Michigan in which she models this with pre-service teachers.

A participant suggested that a listserv should be developed for the teacher educators in the room so that everyone could be in touch with each other and so that questions and ideas could be easily exchanged. BJ Stummel, the staff leader in the room, had everyone's information and volunteered to get this set up. She also volunteered to send the goals that people stated yesterday morning as she collected them and typed them up.

- Needs & Problems Addressed

The main problem addressed in this session was ensuring that ELLs achieve in the classroom by making certain that ELLs acquire academic language skills. ELLs often become proficient in social language but not in academic language, which poses a barrier to academic achievement and limits ELLs' academic potential. Based on the evaluation team's observations, it appeared that many teacher educators were not aware of 1) how to provide ELL students with academic language skills and 2) how to provide teacher candidates with the skills needed to provide ELL students with academic language skills.

- Immediate Outcomes Perceived by the Observer

Participants seemed engaged with the material both during and after the session. Many participants asked M. Schleppegrell questions about additional literature pertaining to this topic and also mentioned to the evaluation team that they learned a lot in this session. Most of the teacher educators also seemed particularly interested in transferring this knowledge to teacher candidates. There was a brief discussion during the last few minutes of the session about how to present this information to teacher candidates so that it can be used in their classrooms. Based on the evaluation team's observation, this session had the following immediate outcomes:

- Participants gained knowledge of academic language and its importance for ELLs
- Participants gained knowledge of how to teach academic language to ELLs
- Participants gained knowledge of how to provide academic language teaching strategies for ELLs to teacher candidates
- Participants' motivation was increased to provide teacher candidates with skills they could use with ELLs

- Intermediate/Long-Term Outcomes

An intermediate outcome is that teacher educators will present theoretical and practical knowledge about academic language to teacher candidates and model use in a classroom setting. A longer-term outcome is that teacher candidates will utilize this knowledge with ELL students in their classrooms. A long-term outcome is that ELL students will gain academic language and have an increased probability of achieving higher success academically.

- Program Theory

M. Schleppegrell provided a combination of direct lecture with PowerPoint slides and interactive activities. M. Schleppegrell first provided the lecture and theoretical background and then ensured that participants experienced and practiced practical application of the knowledge gained from this lecture. In doing this, M. Schleppegrell aimed to ensure that participants

understood both the practical and theoretical components of teaching academic language to ELL students.

This was the last organized session for TQE educators. At the end of this session, they completed a prepared survey, the results of which are presented and summarized in Section 3.

Thursday, August 10, Teacher Candidates

On Thursday, registration and sign-in took place from 8:00 to 8:30 a.m., as on previous days. The TQE candidates were assigned to participate in Stephanie Wessels' session, which began at 8:30 a.m.

Stephanie Wessels: *Vocabulary*

- Context, Environment, & Participants

Similar to Tuesday and Wednesday, in a very large room (the largest out of all strands), approximately 150-200 people sat at round tables with six to eight people at a table. Based on sign-in sheets and the surveys returned, at least 14 of the participants were TQE teacher candidates. Many materials were provided on each table including markers, construction paper, tape, pens, and other materials. The facilitator, Stephanie Wessels, stood at the front of the room with a lapel microphone so that she could easily walk around. Two staff leaders were also in the room to provide any necessary assistance. S. Wessels used a PowerPoint slide presentation during her lecture and throughout the session to explain interactive activities. A large packet of handouts was given to each participant entitled *Elementary Reading Writing and Before During After Other*. These booklets included her PowerPoint slides, articles about teaching ELL students, and activities that could be used in the classroom.

For the most part, participants seemed engaged by this session. There were so many participants in the room that it would have been easy to not stay engaged, but generally participants seemed focused on S. Wessels' presentation. S. Wessels was energetic and engaging, and she intertwined a lot of interactive activities with her lecture, including group work and large-group discussions.

- Resources, Activities, & Procedures

8:30-10:00

S. Wessels began the presentation by briefly describing her goals. She then put up a slide with various candy wrappers displayed—Smartie (very good at teaching vocabulary), Butterfinger (pretty good at teaching vocabulary, but let a few slip through), Crunch (not as good at teaching vocabulary), and Dum Dum (not very good at teaching vocabulary). She asked the audience which candy they felt they were when it came to teaching vocabulary. Most participants felt that they were “Butterfingers.”

S. Wessels then began to discuss teaching vocabulary to ELL students. She said it often takes five to nine years to be fully proficient in English and that direct vocabulary instruction is crucial; students will not become fully proficient simply from reading text. Once students get into junior high and high school and they don't have the vocabulary they need, they will not succeed academically. She stated that there are five stages for learning vocabulary (Krashen's *Stages of Second Language Acquisition*) and that teachers need to base instruction on these stages so that students will remember vocabulary words. The five stages are 1) pre-production, 2) early production, 3) emergence, 4) intermediate fluency, and 5) advanced fluency. She then discussed the importance of understanding two systems (1) Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills (BICS)—social language needed for everyday conversation, and (2) Cognitive Academic

Language Proficiency (CALP)—the language that is needed in the classroom. She also discussed the importance of providing language and sheltered instruction in the classroom. She put up a slide and discussed strategies that facilitate vocabulary learning for ELL students, including students working shoulder-to-shoulder, viewing a video, reading and sharing with a partner, writing, using their imagination, reading and writing, and working cooperatively in groups. The lecture with PowerPoint slides took about 15 minutes.

The first interactive activity that S. Wessels had participants complete was a “jigsaw reading experience,” where participants read the article in their handout entitled *Teacher Skills to Support ELLs*. Participants worked in groups and divided sections of the article so that one person read the first page, another the second page, and so on. Group members then explained the sections they read to the others. The group wrote the top three things they had learned from the article. S. Wessels said that in addition to needing to understand the article, this activity was something teachers could use with students in the classroom. Once each group had read the article, S. Wessels conducted a large group debriefing with each table sharing one thing they learned with the entire audience. Groups said they learned to help ELL students feel comfortable and to use TIPSII, “total group paired small group individual,” a strategy for working with ELL students.

10:15-Noon

After the break S. Wessels presented strategies that could be used in the classroom. Before introducing specific strategies, she discussed “Tier Words,” a way of categorizing words and providing links between words so that ELLs can more easily connect words together—particularly more difficult, “academic” words. She provided this information through a PowerPoint presentation. The “Tier Word” categories were as follows:

- Tier 1: The most basic words that rarely require instruction in school (ex: baby, cold, etc.)
- Tier 2: High-frequency words for mature language users; instruction adds productivity to an individual’s language ability (ex: coincidence, absurd, etc.)
- Tier 3: Words whose frequency is quite low—often limited to specific domains; best learned when needed in a content area (ex: isotope, geometric)

Using the “Tier Words” as background knowledge, S. Wessels began to demonstrate a few activities that could be used in the classroom. After being read a story, such as *Corduroy*, students get into groups and use poster board to retell the story. In addition, the poster board is used by dividing it into nine squares. The teacher then provides nine words from the story and the group has to write what the nine words mean and other words that are related to those nine words. Participants practiced this strategy using previously discussed lessons. S. Wessels then asked groups to discuss the book *Stellaluna*, a book that most of the teachers knew and had read, and briefly brainstorm words they would want to teach from it.

Once participants had a chance to discuss the words they would teach, S. Wessels debriefed with the entire room. Most words worked fine but a few participants chose words such as “unless” that would be difficult to teach to students. This seemed to be a good learning experience for participants because they got a sense of which words would be useful and which would not. There was then a brief discussion about making the right word choices.

Following this discussion, S. Wessels finished her presentation by reviewing PowerPoint slides and discussing specific strategies for classroom use: cognates, word splashes, working memory, KWL strategies, etc. She was unable to get through the entire PowerPoint presentation, but she directed participants to the “blue handouts” in the back of a booklet she distributed, which demonstrated things teachers could work with on their own.

The specific strategies she discussed included the following:

- Story Bag Activity: Go through a list of words or items in the story and ask questions that require students to answer such as, “Is there a ____ in the story?” prior to reading the story. Then read the story and go through the questions and how students answered

- afterwards. This strategy is based on research indicating that repetition is critical for students' learning new vocabulary. In addition, research has found that no more than 8-10 words can be taught effectively each week—so teachers should choose no more than 8-10 words a week.
- Semantic Feature Analysis: To help students understand the meaning of vocabulary words, put together charts which ask questions about related vocabulary words, such as animals. Example: use cat, dog, and fish and place into the columns of a table. In the rows of the table, write questions such as “Does this animal have legs?” or “Does this animal shed hair?” Then within the table, have students answer the questions “yes” or “no.”
 - Word Walls: A word wall is a “systematically organized collection of words displayed in the classroom to promote group learning and is designed to be interactive.” Essentially, the word wall helps children remember connections between words and the characteristics that will help them form categories. Students can guess a word that belongs in a sentence or determine which word fits in a sentence. Another form of a word wall would be to put up words that have multiple meanings such as “trunk” and have students list all of the meanings.

At the end of her session, S. Wessels asked participants to turn to a partner and finish the following sentences as they related to the discussion/topics of the day: 1) I wish..., 2) I wonder..., and 3) I think....

- Needs & Problems Addressed

This presentation addressed any lack of knowledge that participants had about teaching vocabulary to ELL students, including specific strategies and the importance of vocabulary in teaching ELL students to read.

- Immediate Outcomes Perceived by Observer

First, participants have increased knowledge of research related to learning vocabulary. Second, participants have increased knowledge of importance of teaching vocabulary for the purposes of improving ELL student reading skills. Finally, participants have increased knowledge of instructional strategies for teaching vocabulary to ELL students (and mainstream students).

- Intermediate/Long-Term Outcomes

An intermediate outcome is that participants would use specific strategies (see the evaluation team's observation notes above and handouts for specific strategies) provided in this presentation to teach vocabulary in their classrooms. A long term outcome is that ELL students would increase their vocabulary, attain improved reading skills, and achieve and succeed academically.

- Program Theory

S. Wessels provided a direct lecture with PowerPoint slides in order to increase participants' knowledge about theoretical and practical issues related to teaching reading and vocabulary to ELLs. She also engaged participants in interactive discussions and activities to further increase their understanding of topics. Participants were able to process their new knowledge through practical application.

Gilbert Davila (Midwest Equity Assistance Center): *Cultural and Legal Issues*

- Context, Environment, & Participants

Similar to the morning session, approximately 150-200 participants sat in the same large room at round tables with six to eight people at a table. Gilbert Davila stood at the center of the room and used a PowerPoint presentation. He distributed handouts of his PowerPoint slides and was a jovial presenter with a good sense of humor. The audience seemed to connect with him. He also projected slides of his kids and a child he was about to adopt from Guatemala. This seemed to create personal connection between G. Davila and the participants. G. Davila's wife is Socorro Herrera, who presented on Friday. Although participants seemed tired, most of them appeared to be engaged and to enjoy G. Davila's presentation.

- Resources, Activities, & Procedures

1:00-2:15

Prior to beginning his "official" presentation, G. Davila asked that all participants take a pre-test required by the federal office that funds his agency, the Office of Civil Rights. He then handed out a ten-question pre-test entitled "Equal Educational Opportunities for Limited-English Proficient Students." The directions asked participants to "mark the number/box that best represents your present knowledge and performance based on the following scale" (which was a five-point scale ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree"). He reminded participants that after his presentation, participants would complete a post-test.

Once participants filled out the pre-test, G. Davila presented a DVD from Kansas State University entitled "Teatro." This was a short play, written by students at Kansas State University, presenting the lives of ELL students and the challenges of transitioning to higher education. They used interviews of ELL students in higher education and developed them into this production, which included physical movement and spoken word. Essentially, the DVD was a recording of a play that these students presented. The issues that the play discussed were homesickness, dreams, identity, feelings of isolation, and their essential need for support and encouragement, which is "90% of education" (a line from the play).

After the DVD, G. Davila asked the audience what they thought about the DVD (although there was not really a discussion about it) and then said that these same issues are transferable to what is happening in K-12 schools. He discussed the legal issues related to teaching ELLs in schools by going through his PowerPoint slides (he spent most of the time on this—approximately 45 minutes). He displayed the legal language on a PowerPoint slide which stated that you cannot deny ELLs the opportunity to learn successfully in English-only classrooms. G. Davila discussed the legal reasons that ELL programs exist in our country including the following:

- Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964: No person in the US shall on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in programs receiving Federal financial assistance
- Lau v Nichols—1974: "There is no equality of treatment merely by providing ELL students with the same facilities, textbooks, teachers and curriculum; for students who do not understand English are effectively foreclosed from any meaningful instruction."
- Equal Educational Opportunities Act
- Castaneda Standards: A supreme court case that stated that ELL programs must have sound educational theory, effective implementation, and program evaluation/modification
- Office of Civil Rights Policy: Adopts the three items mentioned in the Castaneda court case above

Essentially, ELL programs must provide ELL students the opportunity to learn English in a timely manner and have meaningful access to the district's educational program.

Using the PowerPoint slides, G. Davila went through each of the components of an effective ELL program and discussed them further. He focused more on effective implementation and program evaluation and followed the PowerPoint slides relatively closely. In discussing effective implementation, he encouraged teachers to provide input into any elements that could be improved. He told participants not to assume that all ELL students already had access, as there may be a hitch somewhere in the system. "Don't assume someone else is taking care of every procedure—identify those responsible for every procedure." He also encouraged teachers to review students' files if they thought there was something amiss or if they needed to further understand a students' background. He emphasized that teachers have every legal right to review a students' file, including their use of interpreters, their criteria for eligibility, and documentation of results including the *Home Language Survey* that determines ELL students' primary language other than English.

3:00-4:30

After the break, G. Davila continued with the PowerPoint slide presentations and discussed monitoring and evaluation. He began with NCLB and what was effective and ineffective. He discussed the importance of ensuring that a monitoring system was in place so that ELL students' progress could be determined. He emphasized that you need to document all components of the ELL program including standardized test scores, daily test scores—anything to help ELLs transition into a new program or level. He noted that usually ELLs are monitored for two years and the ELL programs must periodically evaluate its program to ensure that the program is working.

At this point in the presentation, participants had begun to get a bit restless. G. Davila skipped many of the slides that presented information about program evaluation of facilities, instructional materials, peer interaction, staffing, parental notification, and other district programs.

He ended with a discussion on the exit checklist which determined whether an ELL student was ready to leave an ELL program. He emphasized that it is crucial to ensure that ELL students are really ready to leave, otherwise they will have academic difficulties later on. The decision to exit a student from an ELL program should be based on the following factors:

- Reading level equivalent to the mainstream
- Results of English proficiency test
- Scores on district-wide achievement tests
- Recommendations of ESL, bilingual education, and mainstream staff
- Opinion of the parents (sometimes it is necessary to convince parents and students to stay in the program).

He concluded the presentation with a reminder that the Iowa Code states that a fully English-proficient student is a student who is able to use English to ask questions, to understand teachers and reading materials, to test ideas, and to challenge what is being asked in the classroom.

After he was finished speaking he played a second DVD for participants. This was another play from Kansas State University students, but this DVD took place in a classroom setting with approximately eight students of different ethnic backgrounds. In a humorous way they asked serious questions such as what identity is and what identity and diversity mean for people with different backgrounds and races.

- Needs & Problems Addressed

This presentation addressed the lack of understanding or confusion teacher candidates may have had about why ELL programs exist in the United States. This presentation addressed

specific policies and legal precedents that have ensured ELL students receive educational opportunities. Finally, this presentation provided answers to specific legal questions that teachers may have about their ELL students.

- Immediate Outcomes Perceived by Observer

First, participants were more knowledgeable about ELL students' legal rights in the classroom. A second immediate outcome is that participants were more knowledgeable about their legal rights and responsibilities. A third outcome is that participants were more knowledgeable about how to increase educational access to students—such as all students have a right to receive the home language survey—which determines their native language. A fourth outcome is that participants were able to contact G. Davila at the Office of Civil Rights, should they have any difficult questions related to legal rights and responsibilities.

- Intermediate/Long-Term Outcomes

An intermediate outcome is that participants' increased knowledge will lead to increased access to educational opportunities for students. A long-term outcome is that participants will be better able to advocate for their students should legal issues arise.

- Program Theory

G. Davila provided a lecture based presentation with PowerPoint slides and two video clips. There was limited participant interaction but G. Davila was an engaging presenter who provided many stories and anecdotes that illustrated specific legal issues during his presentation. The evaluation team believes his program theory was to increase teacher knowledge of ELL educational legal issues and awareness of ELL educational challenges by providing a direct lecture and presentation of PowerPoint slides and the DVD described above. By using the DVD, the evaluation team assumes he intended for participants to gain an increased understanding and awareness ELL students' challenges. By discussing the legal rights of ELLs, the evaluation team assumes he intended for participants to feel empowered and educated from a legal standpoint to help ELL students deal with these challenges. He also wanted to create awareness of precedents and resources that teachers could bring to bear on their own questions and concerns regarding ELLs in the schools.

Friday, August 11, Teacher Candidates

Socorro Herrera: *Elementary Reading & Writing*

- Context, Environment, & Participants

Similar to the Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday sessions, this session occurred in the same large room with approximately 150-200 people sitting at round tables with six to eight people per table. The facilitator, Socorro Herrera, stood at the front of the room with a lapel microphone so that she could easily walk around. Two staff leaders were also in the room in case she needed any assistance. S. Herrera used a PowerPoint slide presentation to lecture and to explain interactive activities throughout the session. A large binder was given to each participant entitled *Classroom Strategies for the English Language Learner*. This binder included eight sections with strategies for working with English Language Learners to help them accelerate language and literacy development.

For the most part, participants seemed engaged in this session. S. Herrera was very engaging and provided many “hands-on,” interactive activities. Despite the fact that it was the last day of a five-day workshop, participants seemed engaged. There were so many participants in the room, however, that it would be easy to not stay engaged by the session. In addition, the observer could not distinguish TQE candidates from Our Kids in-service teachers and could not offer an opinion about differences in engagement between the two groups of participants.

- Resources, Activities, & Procedures

8:30-10:15

S. Herrera began her session with a short one-minute video clip of a German man who is in a coast guard type job. He hears an English man speaking over the radio—the English man is saying, “We’re sinking! We’re sinking!” The German man then responds with, “What are you sinking about?” The participants all enjoyed this brief clip and laughed. From an observer’s point of view, it was a humorous way of capturing participants’ attention and also demonstrating the purpose of the session.

S. Herrera then divided participants into groups via playing cards. Once groups have been divided up by “high cards,” “middle cards,” and “low cards,” S. Herrera described what type of education each of the groups will have access to. The people with “high cards” will have access to anything they want. They have all the money and resources in the world and can have any type of education they prefer. People with the “middle cards” have parents who are teachers’ kids. They will work very hard to accomplish something but do not have the access and resources that people with the “high cards” have. People with the “low cards” do have few resources and little access. Their access to educational opportunities is often denied. S. Herrera then described various scenarios to make the point that no matter what card you have, your background is more complex. For example, maybe you have all the money in the world but you do not have a good support system to nurture you through challenging situations. On the other hand, maybe you do not have access to many educational opportunities but you have parents who provide you with a lot of strength to break down many barriers. S. Herrera’s point was that teachers need to pay attention to the biography of the children in their classrooms. She believed that children are at risk if teachers do not understand their backgrounds and the circumstances that surround them outside the classroom. The more teachers understand who their students are, the more effective they will be—“everything is about biography.”

S. Herrera then provided a strategy for students to present their biography—an activity called, “My Life in Six Photos.” The teacher asks students to close their eyes and think of the six most important moments/events that have occurred in their lives. Once they have thought of them, they write them down and draw a picture for each moment. S. Herrera asked each table to practice this activity by writing down the six most significant moments or learning experiences that occurred this week. Participants recorded their moments on large pieces of paper at their tables, draw pictures, and hung the posters on the wall. (Below are the top six learning moments that occurred at the Our Kids 2006 Summer Institute according to this set of participant groups, based on evaluation team photos and notes):

Poster A

- Comprehensibility
- Stages of development
- Tier II vocabulary
- Visuals
- Components of reading
- Background—biography
- 2nd language acquisition
- Comprehensible input
- Vocabulary
- Math—“Not hands on if teacher only teaches multiplication”
- Communicate & share ideas
- Policy—document, document, document

Poster B

Poster C

- Comprehensible input
- Increase interaction
- Differentiated instruction
- Cultural appreciation
- Networking
- Terminology

Poster D

- Biography—know every student's background
- Social & academic language
- www.meac.org; “we do have help!” (from G. Davila's presentation)
- Vocabulary, vocabulary, vocabulary!
- ELL kids need more than short ESL pullouts—they need all their teachers using the strategies
- Provide explicit instruction and practice in content vocabulary use

Poster E

- Realia
- ELL strategies for all students
- Stages
- Connections/prior knowledge
- Let them speak in native language
- Vocabulary is tied to comprehension

Poster F

- We need to teach language in all content areas
- Understand and appreciate family's circumstances
- Have multiple representation of vocabulary
- Repetitive examples
- High expectations for all learners
- Cooperative learning through concrete...?

Poster G

- Polyopolis
- Teaching backwards
- Math
- Stages of language acquisition
- Tiers of vocabulary
- Concrete to abstract

Poster H

- Know all students' backgrounds
- Qualified teachers trained in ELL state
- Qualified teachers trained in ELL strategies
- “If vocab development & comprehension are not at the root of a lesson, it is a stupid and useless waste of time.”
- There is a difference between social and academic language
- We need a systemic change for a real impact.
- Two objectives for every lesson: language and content!

Poster I

- Specific classroom strategies
- Stages of acquisition
- Principles to enhance learning
- Legal requirements
- Vocabulary related to comprehension
- Know individual students

Poster J

- Use of visuals
- Modeling
- Differentiate instruction
- Vocabulary building
- Scaffolding
- Assessing background knowledge

Poster K

- Tiered vocabulary
- Instruction for concrete to abstract
- Vocabulary embedded in content areas
- Biography is everything

Poster L

- Stages of language acquisition
- Differentiated instruction
- Legal issues
- Language & culture
- Know the background of your students
- Personal connection

Poster M

- Empathy
- Vocabulary
- Demonstrations act-out
- Music is universal
- Who am I? I am who I am! (diverse backgrounds)

- One size does not fit all

Poster N

- Networking
- Simulation
- Biography, biography
- Comprehensible input
- Repetition
- Pacing

Poster O

- Simulation/panel; empathy
- Know backgrounds
- Know stages of language acquisition
- Vocabulary builds comprehension
- Importance of comprehensible input
- Provide opportunities for oral language practice

Poster P

- Vocabulary development before, during, and after
- Concrete to abstract
- Background of each of your std. [students]; empathy!
- Verbal interaction with students...less teacher talk
- Teacher training
- Use demos, gestures, visuals...?

Poster Q

- Simulation
- Strategies
- Stages of language acquisition
- Law!
- Keep it fun!
- Everyone is capable of...?

Poster R

- Find out each students' background
- Visuals are a must!
- Repetition, repetition, repetition
- Stages of language acquisition
- It takes 4-7 years for students to be language proficient

Poster S

- It's all about biography!
- Visuals and gestures are sometimes the only means of conversation
- Embracing culture ...create a safe environment

Poster T

- Icons work (realia)
- Empathy & understanding
- PEPSI
- Vocabulary
- Support content with language goals
- Document, document, document

Poster U

- Stages of language acquisition
- History, biography, identity, experiences, culture
- Music
- BKS vs. CALPS—both needed
- Math word wall

Poster V

- Background, know your students
- Connect, content & language
- Document, track everything
- Diversity, valued & historic
- Best teaching for all, ELL, Special Ed, TAG, Poverty, Privileged)
- Building on individual knowledge

After the break, S. Herrera and participants briefly discussed the posters and how this would work with students in the classroom. S. Herrera then spent time (until the lunch break) going through her PowerPoint slide presentation.

Survey Administration

After lunch, participants received the CEA survey which was administered by the staff leader, Jan Grimes. Jan, Danielle (the other staff leader), and the evaluation team handed out consent forms first. Once participants filled out the consent forms, they were given the survey. Because people were straggling in from lunch, this seemed to work out well. During the survey administration, it was discovered that many people were “workshop hopping.” Jan then made an announcement that if participants had not signed-up for the elementary strand and were actually in another strand, then they should go back to their strand to fill out the correct survey.

1:20-2:20

After the survey administration, S. Herrera put up slides about second language acquisition and asked participants to discuss this topic for approximately 5 minutes. The discussion evolved into that of how to accomplish what S. Herrera proposed with so many competing goals in the classroom and with so many other things going on. Furthermore, how can you determine students’ levels with so many things going on in the classroom? For an additional ten minutes, participants discussed at their table how increased teacher knowledge will lead to increased access to educational opportunities for students given what they learned about the stages of language acquisition.

After participants discussed this topic with each other, S. Herrera discussed how a child’s culture plays into their language development: “If the culture of the child is different, so is the language.” She then had teachers stand up by grade and she brought up six people from different grades and explained that they would be doing a “chain story” or a “story retell.” As an audience member, you were supposed to listen for their language and vocabulary—does the story flow? Is it rich vocabulary? The six participants doing the “chain story” were to explain photosynthesis but were not allowed to use any words that start with the letters P, T, S, or L. The “chain story” process involves one person saying a few sentences, then the next person beginning where that person left off, and so on down the line. In doing this exercise, many of the participants struggled with finding additional language or vocabulary to describe words such as plant or sun. In addition, these six participants had to stand up and do this in front of approximately 180 people so it seemed a bit unnerving. In addition, it seemed to help participants understand how it feels when you cannot express yourself when you have something that you’re trying to say.

S. Herrera then began to discuss cognitive academic proficiency and stated this exercise demonstrates how challenging it is not to have vocabulary knowledge and how ELL students struggle. She asked, “How could we have supported the storytellers?” The following answers were provided: visuals, having them talk to someone before they retell, realia, and have them express what they mean in a different way.

3:00-4:00

For the last hour, S. Herrera demonstrated various strategies that could be used in the classroom to advance students literacy and vocabulary. She also called attention to strategies outlined in the binder she handed out.

One of the participants asked how they could manage the CLD student biographies. She suggested using 3x5 file cards. She explained that you could not bridge and connect unless you have information on students.

- Needs & Problems Addressed

This session addressed any lack of awareness teachers may have had about teaching reading and writing to ELL elementary students. Most importantly though, this session addressed any lack of awareness teachers may have had about the role that culture, background, and environment play in students’ success at school and in effective teaching.

- Immediate Outcomes Perceived by Observer

One immediate outcome is that participants have increased knowledge about the connection between student culture and language. A second immediate outcome is that participants have increased awareness about ELL students' language barriers in the classroom. A third immediate outcome is that participants have increased empathy about ELL students' language barriers in the classroom. A fourth immediate outcome is that participants have increased knowledge about the importance of understanding ELL (and all) students' background (biography) in order to be an effective teacher. A fifth immediate outcome is that participants have increased knowledge about practical strategies for teaching reading and writing to ELL elementary students.

- Intermediate/Long-Term Outcomes

One intermediate outcome is that participants will focus more on environment and background of students—specifically ELL students. This may lead to long-term outcomes that ELL students will feel comfortable and safe in their classroom environment and that ELL students will learn more effectively in a comfortable environment.

A second intermediate outcome is that participants will effectively implement teaching strategies (as discussed above and as presented in the binder S. Herrera handed out). This may lead to longer-term outcomes that ELL students will improve their reading and writing skills and that ELL students will achieve and succeed academically.

- Program Theory

Similar to L. Franco and S. Wessels, S. Herrera utilized a direct lecture with PowerPoint slides, group discussion, and interactive activities that required participants to experience strategies that could be used in the classroom with students. The goal of S. Herrera's lecture was to increase participants' knowledge about theoretical and practical issues related to teaching ELLs reading and vocabulary. Interactive discussions and activities further increased participants' understanding of topics and allowed them to process their new knowledge through practical application.

This completes the detailed description of the presentations/sessions that teacher educators and candidates participated in, as observed and recorded by evaluation staff members. The next section addresses the reported degree of engagement reported by teacher candidates and educators as learners in these individual sessions.

4.2.2. How engaged were the teacher candidates and educators in the 2006 Summer Institute? Findings from the 2006 Summer Institute survey of teacher candidates

Third Quantitative Section: Degree of Engagement

In this section, the teacher candidates responded about their degree of engagement as learners in the sessions. The directions for this section were as follows:

Now for the same list of events or presentations, please indicate how engaged you were as a participant, using the scale on the right. If you don't have an opinion, or if you didn't attend, please circle "nr" for "no response". Please write any comments you have in the margins.

Table 6 presents the number of participants responding in each of the categories: *non-learner*, *semi-attentive*, *engaged recipient*, *active cooperator*, *advanced synthesizer* and *integrator*, and *no response*. This scale encouraged participants to rate their own engagement and reflected their individual experiences as learners in each session.

The sessions with the largest number of *advanced synthesizer* and *integrator* responses were the *Life in a Second Language Simulation* and *Discussion* (n=7 each). Several sessions received a number of *active cooperator* responses: Socorro Herrera's *Reading and Writing* (n=7), Judy Kinley's *Elementary Math* (n=6), Linda Franco's *What's Different About Teaching Reading?* (n=5), and Marcella Parra and Gilbert Davila's *Culture and Legal Issues* and Stephanie Wessels' *Vocabulary* (n=5 each). Those sessions receiving *non-learner* responses (ranging from 1 to 4 responses each) were the shorter presentations. James Crawford's Keynote Address, *Education Policy and Language Politics* also received relatively more *non-learner* responses (n=6).

Table 6

Frequencies of teacher candidates' engagement as a learner in each session

<i>How engaged were you as a learner for each of the following? (n = 14)</i>	Non-Learner	Semi-Attentive	Engaged Recipient	Active Cooperator	Advanced Synthesizer & Integrator	No Response
Stephaney Jones-Vo – <i>Orientation</i>	3	5	5	0	0	1
Helene Grossman – <i>Our Kids DVD</i>	1	5	5	0	0	3
James Crawford – <i>Education Policy & Language Politics</i>	6	5	2	0	0	1
Vinh Nguyen – <i>Parents & Community</i>	0	0	8	2	3	1
“Life in a Second Language” Simulation	0	0	0	(1) 5	7	1
Discussion of “Life in a Second Language” Simulation	0	0	0	(1) 5	7	1
Judy Kinley – <i>Elementary Math</i>	0	1	5	6	2	0
Lynda Franco – <i>What's Different About Teaching Reading?</i>	0	2	4	(1) 5	2	0
Mario Sosa— <i>Confessions of a Multicultural Music Teacher</i>	4	4	4	1	1	0
Stephanie Wessels – <i>Vocabulary</i>	0	1	5	5	3	0

Marcella Parra & Gilbert Davila – <i>Culture & Legal Issues</i>	0	1	7	5	1	0
Dr. Socorro Herrera – <i>Reading & Writing</i>	0	0	3	(1) 7	2	1

Frequencies in parentheses, (1) indicate a response on the border between *engaged recipient* and *active cooperator*. One respondent indicated this modification for four sessions.

4.2.2 (continued). How engaged were the teacher candidates and educators in the 2006 Summer Institute? Findings from the 2006 Summer Institute survey of teacher educators

Third Quantitative Section: Amount of Engagement in the Sessions

In this section, the teacher educators responded just as did the teacher candidates about their degree of engagement as learners in the sessions. The directions for this section were as follows:

Now for the same list of presentations, please indicate how engaged you were as a participant, using the scale on the right. Circle the number that best describes your learning engagement for that session, using the following scale. If you don't have an opinion, or if you didn't attend the specific presentation, please circle "nr" for "no response." Please write any comments you have in the margins.

Table 7 presents the number of teacher educators responding in each of the categories: *non-learner*, *semi-attentive*, *engaged recipient*, *active cooperator*, *advanced synthesizer and integrator*, and *no response*. This scale encouraged teacher educators to rate their own engagement and reflects their individual experiences as learners in each session. The sessions with the largest number of *advanced synthesizer and integrator* responses were the *Life in a Second Language Simulation* (n=14), the *Discussion of Life in a Second Language Simulation* and Mary Schleppegrell's *Academic Language* (n=12 each), and Kathleen Bailey's *Teacher Training* (n=11). All other sessions received a mixture of *semi-attentive*, *engaged recipient*, and *active cooperator* responses (ranging from 1 to 7, 4 to 9, and 1 to 6 responses, respectively). The sessions that received *non-learner* responses (ranging from 1 to 2) were Stephaney Jones-Vo's *Orientation*, James Crawford's *Education Policy and Language Politics*, Norma Hernandez's *Funding Resources*, and Mario Sosa's *A Recent Graduate's Perspective*.

Table 7

Frequencies of teacher educator engagement as a learner in each session

<i>How engaged were you as a learner for each of the following? (n=20)</i>	Non-Learner	Semi-Attentive	Engaged Recipient	Active Cooperator	Advanced Synthesizer & Integrator	No Response
Stephaney Jones-Vo – <i>Orientation</i>	1	1	8	6	0	4

Helene Grossman – <i>Our Kids DVD</i> *	0	0	9	3	1	6
Vinh Nguyen – <i>Parents & Community</i>	0	0	7	4	6	3
“Life in a Second Language” Simulation	0	0	1	3	14	2
Discussion of “Life in a Second Language” Simulation	0	0	2	4	12	2
James Crawford – <i>Education Policy & Language Politics</i>	2	7	4	1	0	6
Kathleen Bailey – <i>Teacher Training</i>	0	1	0	6	11	2
Norma Hernandez – <i>Funding Resources</i>	2	3	8	2	3	2
Mario Sosa— <i>A Recent Graduate’s Perspective</i>	1	0	6	4	9	0
Mary Schleppegrell – <i>Academic Language</i>	0	1	1	6	12	0

*One respondent did not respond to this item

4.2.3. How many teacher educators and candidates have participated in the TQELL component and what are their demographic characteristics?

Results across these surveys indicate that teacher educators in the TQE program bring a diverse range of prior ELL experience, teaching experience, and facility with non-native languages. For example, a large number of participants do not consider themselves experienced or knowledgeable about ELLs; however, some participants have specialized in various areas related to ELLs and report a high level of knowledge concerning ELLs.

4.2.3.1. Findings from ICLC 2006 surveys

The demographic results suggest that the participants who completed the February ICLC and the April ICLC Surveys were similar, including the professional status of respondents. In both months, most respondents indicated that they were *higher education instructors/professors* (April, n=18; February, n=17). A similar number of respondents for both months indicated that they were *teacher candidates* (April, n=10 February, n=10).

Educators responding on both surveys were primarily women (April, n=17; February; n=12). The majority of educators were between the ages of 41-50 and 51-65 for the February and April surveys. In terms of the number of years taught, nine educators reported having taught for 15 years or more on the April survey and eight reported teaching for 15 years or more on the

February survey. Courses taught included: TESOL certification, math, language arts, educational psychology, introduction to education, elementary education, social studies methods, special education assessment, and art.

Most of the educators for both surveys indicated that they spoke English with native fluency (April, n=11; February, n=10) with a few stating they spoke Spanish (April, n=2; February, n=1). On the April survey, educators indicated that they could communicate in a variety of other languages including Spanish (n=4), French (n=2), German (n=2), or Bulgarian, Arabic, Malay, Dutch, and sign language (n=1 for each language). Only two educators responded on the February survey; both indicated they could communicate in Spanish.

The April survey had three additional items on the demographic section which were not on the February survey. These items asked the following: *Have you participated in the Our Kids Institute before? Are you a lead team member? Do you consider yourself experienced with ELLs?* Of the 18 educators, three reported participating in an earlier Summer Institute, seven indicated that they were lead team members, and five considered themselves experienced with ELL.

All but one candidate responding on the February and April surveys was female and none of the candidates had teaching experience. The majority of candidates were between the ages of 19-23, with only two candidates between the ages of 30-45. Most of the candidates for both surveys indicated they spoke English with native fluency (April, n=6; February, n=6). On the April survey, six candidates indicated they could communicate in Spanish (not fluently).

4.2.3.2 Findings from the April 2006 survey of TQELL Participants not at the ICLC

All six respondents were female and included two teacher candidates and four teacher educators. Age for the educators ranged from 40 years to 55 years old and age for the candidates ranged from 20 to 23 years old. The number of years teaching for the educators ranged from 15 to 34 years of experience and included the following subjects: multicultural education (2), reading and language arts, music, applied educational psychology, and a variety of methods courses including social studies (2), math, and general methods.

One educator considered themselves experienced with ELLs; the two candidates and the other three educators did not consider themselves experienced with ELLs. Two educators had participated in previous Summer Institutes and one was a lead team member. Reported languages spoken with fluency consisted solely of English for all but one participant, an educator who reported speaking both English and Spanish fluently. Reported languages spoken well enough to communicate (but participant does not consider themselves to be fluent), included one educator who reported Spanish and one candidate who reported sign language.

4.2.3.3. Findings from the 2006 Summer Institute demographics survey for teacher candidates

The following results are the demographic characteristics reported by the teacher candidates who responded to the survey at the 2006 Summer Institute. One question asked candidates to report whether or not they had prior experience teaching ELLs. The average number of ELLs taught during the 2005-06 school year was 4.36, n=11; the average number of ELLs respondents expected to teaching during the 2006-07 school year was 4.11, n=9. All 14 respondents reported that participating in the Summer Institute had encouraged them to consider obtaining an ELL certification.

Additional questions addressed the subject matters that candidates would teach (Table 8) and the candidate's preparation and experience teaching ELLs (Table 9).

Table 8

Frequency of subjects/classes taught or that will be taught (select all that apply)

Business 0	Computer / Media Technology 1	English / Language Arts 10
Family Consumer Science 1	Fine Arts (Art / Drama / Music) 1	Foreign Language 1
History / Social Studies 7	Industrial Technology 0	Mathematics 9
Natural Science 6	Physical Education 0	Special Education 4
ESL certified pullout classroom 4	Other 1 (please specify):	

Table 9

Candidates' preparation and experience teaching ELLs (select all that apply)

Preparation	Frequency
None	6
ELL Endorsement	5
In-services/Conferences	4
Classroom experience teaching ELLs	1
Other	1
Graduate Education	0

4.2.3.3 (continued). Findings from the 2006 Summer Institute demographics survey for teacher educators

The following are the demographic characteristics reported by the teacher educators who responded to the survey at the 2006 Our Kids Summer Institute. Regarding current status, 18 reported higher education instructor/professor and two reported a status of 'other.'

Table 10 presents the frequency of educators' responses to the question of their prior preparation and experience teaching ELLs.

Table 10

Educators' preparation and experience teaching ELLs (select all that apply)

Preparation	Frequency
In-services/Conferences	11
Classroom experience teaching ELLs [†]	8

None	6
Graduate Education	4
ELL Endorsement	2
Other	2

† Average number of years was 7.83, n=6

4.2.3.4. Demographic summaries from 2007 ICLC survey of teacher candidates

Tables 11 and 12 report the sex and age of the teacher candidates who filled out surveys at the 2007 ICLC conference.

Table 11

Gender of responding teacher candidates

<i>Gender</i>	<i>n</i>
Male	1
Female	24

Table 12

Age of responding teacher candidates

<i>Age</i>	<i>n</i>
19 – 30	19
31 – 40	5
41 – 50	1
60 or above	0

Teaching Experience

The survey also included a number of questions related to teacher candidates' prior teaching experience, summarized below.

Where do you teach?

Four teacher candidates reported they are currently student teaching; only one reported teaching, but did not indicate where s/he was teaching.

What classes do you teach?

Six teacher candidates responded to this question; reported areas included: English, science, literacy, k-6, ESL, and elementary special education inclusion.

How many years have you been teaching?

Since most teacher candidates are either student teaching or are still in school, only two reported a number of years taught. One reported having taught 4-6 years in the military and another reported having taught for less than one year.

Prior ELL experience

The following questions were asked to gather information on the amount and type of prior ELL experience the TQELL teacher candidates have had, including experience in the TQELL grant. Twelve of the 25 respondents indicated they participated in this year's ICLC, but only six reported they were part of this year's TQELL program. Table 13 provides summaries of the candidates' prior participation in related programs for ELLs (such as the Our Kids Program), the TQE Program and the Summer Institute at various levels.

Table 13

Teacher candidates' reported program participation (select all that apply)

<i>Our Kids Grant</i>		<i>Teacher Quality (TQE) Grant</i>		<i>Summer Institute</i>	
Our Kids I 2004	(0)	TQE 2006	(1)	Our Kids I	(0)
Our Kids I 2005	(0)	TQE 2007	(6)	Our Kids II	(0)
Our Kids I 2006	(0)	ICLC 2006	(2)	Our Kids III	(0)
Our Kids II 2005	(0)	ICLC 2007	(12)	TQE Candidate	(1)
Our Kids II 2006	(0)	Other	(0)	Other	(1)
Our Kids III	(0)				

As indicated in Table 14 below, most teacher candidates have had no prior experience or preparation teaching ELLs. Five reported they had an ELL endorsement, four reported having some graduate education related to ELLs, three reported classroom experience teaching ELLs, and two reported ELL preparation from prior conferences. The five comments in the other category included two responses that indicated ELL tutoring, student teaching, thesis work, exchange programs, and a minor in TESOL. Respondents were asked to select all options that applied to them, so total frequency for this question does not match the number of responding candidates.

Table 14

Teacher candidates' preparation and experience teaching ELLs

Preparation/experience	n
None	11
ELL Endorsement	5
Graduate Education [†]	4
Classroom experience teaching ELLs [‡]	3
In-service(s)/Conference(s) [‡]	2
Other [†]	5

[†]Included: "currently in graduate education program," "MS in teaching," "MAT: endorsed English, Spanish, ELL"

[‡]Included: "ICLC 06-07 TQELL 07," "last year's conference"

[†] Number of years: "3-through NWC," "4," "1"

] Included: “ELL tutoring,” “ELL tutoring for college class,” “thesis work; exchange programs,” “I’m minoring in TESOL w/ elementary education,” “student teaching”

4.2.3.4 (continued). Demographic summaries from 2007 ICLC survey of teacher educators

Tables 15 and 16 summarize the sex and age of the participating teacher educators

Table 15

Gender of responding teacher educators

<i>Gender</i>	<i>n</i> [†]
Male	4
Female	12

[†]One respondent did not indicate gender

Table 16

Age of responding teacher educators

<i>Age</i>	<i>n</i>
19 – 30	1
31 – 40	5
41 – 50	2
51 – 60	6
61 – 65	2
65+	0

[†]One respondent did not indicate gender

Teaching Experience

The demographic sections also addressed additional questions about where and what the teacher educators taught. The questions and answers are summarized below.

Where do you teach?

Institutions of responding educators included Drake, Dordt, Buena Vista, William Penn, Northwestern College, University of Northern Iowa (UNI), Morningside, and Emmaus.

What classes do you teach?

There were a total of 51 responses from 15 teacher educators. Almost all teacher educators reported more than one course that they had either taught or are currently teaching. Responses were categorized and are reported in Table 17. The narrative following this table provides additional details on each of the categories.

Table 17

Classes taught by responding teacher educators

<i>Category</i>	<i>n</i>
ESL / ELL	9
Linguistics / Language acquisition	8
Methods courses	8
Assessment / Research methods	6
TESOL	5
Culture / Diversity	3
Reading / grammar	3
Children's literature	2
Educational psychology	2
Special education / LD	2
Other	3

Nine responses indicated ESL and ELL courses; two of these specified ESL writing. Other specific ESL or ELL courses in this category included foundations of teaching ESL/ELL, academic interaction for ESL students, ESL business, and ESL practicum and tutoring. The next two categories, linguistics/language acquisition and methods courses, each had eight responses. Some educators specified methods courses: elementary social studies, literacy, elementary math/science, elementary reading/LA, and expressive arts in elementary school.

In the fourth category, six responses indicated assessment or research methods courses. In the fifth category, five responses mentioned Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) courses. Various TESOL courses mentioned included introduction to TESOL, TESOL methods courses, and practicum in TESOL.

The next two categories, culture and reading, each had three responses. Culture courses specified included American culture and a diversity seminar. Reading courses included reading in the content areas, TSL [TESOL] grammar, and early literacy courses. The following three categories, children's literature, educational psychology, and special education, each had two responses. There were three responses in the "other" category, which included human development, early childhood education, and secondary education.

How many years have you been teaching?

The average number of years teaching was nearly 18 ($M=17.7$). Two respondents did not provide a response for this question. A few respondents specified the various types of teaching experience they had. For example, one respondent wrote: "4 overseas; 7 K-12 in the U.S.; ... 1+ -part-time for [college/university]."

Prior ELL experience

Educators' reported prior ELL experience is displayed in Tables 18 and 19.

Table 18

Teacher educators' reported program participation (select all that apply)

<i>Our Kids Grant</i>		<i>Teacher Quality (TQE) Grant</i>		<i>Summer Institute</i>	
Our Kids I 2004	(0)	TQE 2006	(6)	Our Kids I	(3)
Our Kids I 2005	(0)	TQE 2007	(9)	Our Kids II	(1)
Our Kids I 2006	(0)	ICLC 2006	(7)	Our Kids III	(0)
Our Kids II 2005	(1)	ICLC 2007	(11)	TQE Candidate	(0)
Our Kids II 2006	(0)	Other	(0)	Other [†]	(1)
Our Kids III	(1)				

[†]Teacher trainer

Similar to the trend noted in Table 13 in the teacher candidates' results, of the 11 respondents who checked this year's ICLC there were only nine respondents that checked they were involved with this year's TQE program.

Table 19

Teacher educators' preparation and experience teaching ELLs (select all that apply)

<i>Preparation/experience</i>	<i>n</i>
None	3
ELL Endorsement	2
Graduate Education	10
In-service(s)/Conference(s) [‡]	6
Classroom experience teaching ELL students [†]	7
Other	9

[†]Included: ICLC (n=3); SIOP; NABE, TESOL, MIDTESOL

[‡] Number of years: 15 (n=2), 7 (n=2), 5, 4, 3.5, 1, a semester, "a few ELLs in college classroom"

More detailed descriptions of the "graduate education" and "other" categories in Table 19 follow. Of the 10 respondents who marked graduate education, eight provided descriptions. Two of these eight responded that ESL issues were integrated into graduate work. Four responses indicated completion of a doctoral degree; areas of study included second language acquisition, foreign language and ESL education, doctoral minor in bilingual education, and curriculum and instruction. Two responses mentioned attaining a master's degree in TSEOL. Other areas of study included school psychology, educational administration, linguistics, and intercultural studies.

Responses in the "other" option were varied, ranging from experiences that sensitized the educator to the need for teacher preparation regarding ELLs to specific roles and responsibilities (e.g.,

adult ELL teacher). Examples of responses in the other category included living in another country, supervising ELL pre-service teachers, helping to start a dual language program, owning a small business that provided ESL services and education, acting as a Title III contact for a district, and serving as a No Child Left Behind compliance coordinator.

4.2.3.5. Frequency of Participation by Institution

Following the 2006 Summer Institute, the evaluation team compiled a list of institutions participating in the TQE program. This information is provided in Table 20. This list was updated following the 2007 ICLC; these results are provided in Table 21. Narratives summarizing trends follow each table. The purpose of these tables is to document the institutions that are involved, at least on paper, in the TQELL component and to be able to contact them to investigate their activities, planning and other participation even if their educators and candidates do not all attend or attend but do not fill out surveys or other information at any of the planned TQELL events.

Table 20

Participating institutes of higher education, educators and candidates 2006

Institution	Educator	Candidate
Briar Cliff University	3	2
Dordt College	2	
Eastern Iowa Community College	2	
EC4, EC7	1	
EC5, EC8	1	
Emmaus Bible College	2	
Graceland University	1	
Iowa Central Community College	2	
Iowa State University	8	4
Iowa Valley Community College	2	
Iowa Western Community College	1	
Morningside College	2	
Mount Mercy College	2	
Northeast Iowa Community College	1	
Simpson College	4	4
Southeastern Community College	2	
Southwestern Community College	1	
TQELL Lead Team	1	
University of Northern Iowa	4	

Upper Iowa University	2	
William Penn University	7	9
Total	51	19

As can be seen, in 2006 there were a total of 51 educators and 19 candidates from a total of 18 post-secondary institutions. At this point, the majority of participants were teacher educators; participation by institution varied, with most institutions having one or two educators participating. Institutions with the highest educator participation included Iowa State with eight educators and William Penn with seven educators.

Table 21

Participating institutes of higher education, educators and candidates 2007

Institution	Educators	Candidates [†]
Briar Cliff University	2	8
Buena Vista College	2	3
Dordt College	2	0
Drake	6 [±]	11
Emmaus Bible College	2	6
Graceland University	4	2
Iowa State University	10	6
Morningside College	3	2
Mount Mercy College	2	3
Northwestern	4 [±]	2
Simpson College	4	9
University of Northern Iowa	9	17
Upper Iowa University	4	1
William Penn University	4	19
Total	58	91

[±]During educator interviews, one educator from this IHE told us she was no longer part of TQE

[†]Two teacher candidates were noted as in TQE and are included in the total count; institution is unknown.

By early 2007, participation in the TQE ELL project had increased almost to the program capacity, which is 155. There was a large increase in teacher candidates, with 91 participating as of February 2007; educator participation rose from 51 in 2006 to 58. Institutions participating in TQE shifted somewhat. While some participants from community colleges participated in the Our Kids 2006 Summer Institute, it was reported by program staff that these educators were not retained for 2007. Some additional four-year institutions were added in 2007, namely Buena Vista and Drake. There was a total of 14 participating higher education institutions in 2007

The next step in understanding the nature of participation was to sort educators and candidates who attended TQELL professional development opportunities according to the

institutional affiliation. This information is provided in Tables 22 and 23, which report enrollment and survey response for educators and candidates at the 2006 Summer Institute and the 2007 ICLC. These tables report both then numbers of the participants who signed in and the numbers who completed and returned surveys.

Table 22

Summary of TQELL educators enrolled and responding

Institution	Professional Development			
	Summer Institute 2006		ICLC 2007	
	Participants	Survey respondents	Participants [±]	Survey respondents
Briar Cliff University	3	2	0	-
Buena Vista College	0	0	2	2
Dordt College	2	2	1	1
Drake	0	0	4	4
Eastern Iowa Community College	2	0	n/a	n/a
Emmaus Bible College	2	2	1	1
Graceland University	0	0	0	-
Iowa Central Community College	2	0	n/a	n/a
Iowa State University	4	3	5	0
Iowa Valley Community College	1	0	n/a	n/a
Iowa Western Community College	1	0	n/a	n/a
Morningside College	2	2	2	1
Mount Mercy College	0	0	1	0
Northeast Iowa Community College	1	0	n/a	n/a
Northwestern	0	0	2	1
Scott Community College	2	0	n/a	n/a
Simpson College	4	2	3	0
Southeastern Community College	2	0	n/a	n/a
Southwestern Community College	1	1	n/a	n/a
University of Northern Iowa	3	2	5	4
Upper Iowa University	2	0	1	0
William Penn University	4	2	4	3
Total	38	18	31	17

[±]Educators from community colleges participated in 2006, but dropped out of the program by 2007

The overall number of educators participating was slightly lower for the ICLC than for the Summer Institute; it was reported by program leaders that some IHE had scheduling conflicts during the ICLC, making participation more difficult for some educators. On the other hand, the overall number of candidates participating was much higher for the ICLC, as indicated in Table 23. Particular IHEs had relatively high numbers of candidates enrolled in the ICLC, including Drake, University of Northern Iowa, and William Penn.

Table 23

Summary of TQELL candidates enrolled and responding

Institution	Professional Development			
	Summer Institute 2006		ICLC 2007	
	Participants	Survey respondents	Participants [±]	Survey respondents
Briar Cliff University	2	2	0	-
Buena Vista College	0	-	3	1
Dordt College	0	-	0 [±]	-
Drake	0	-	9	6
Emmaus Bible College	0	-	3	3
Graceland University	0	-	0	-
Iowa State University	4	4	1	0
Morningside College	0	-	2	0
Mount Mercy College	0	-	2	2
Northwestern	0	-	2	2
Simpson College	3	3	6	0
University of Northern Iowa	0	-	7	2
Upper Iowa University	0	-	1	0
William Penn University	7	5	19	9
Total	16	14	55	25

[±]This is the only IHE with educators involved but no students involved.

In summary, 17 IHEs participated in the 2006 Summer Institute, sending a total of 38 educators. A total of 18 teacher educators from 10 of these 17 IHEs completed and returned evaluation forms. Only 4 of the 17 IHEs sent teacher candidates to the Summer Institute. Of the 16 teacher candidates registering, only 14 filled out and returned their evaluation forms.

With regard to the 2007 ICLC, 12 IHEs sent a total of 31 teacher educators. A total of 17 teacher educators from 8 participating IHEs filled out and returned surveys. Eleven (of the 12) IHEs sent a total of 55 teacher candidates who registered for the ICLC. A total of 25 teacher candidates from 7 (of these 11) filled out and turned in surveys.

4.3. Q3 Findings

In what ways has participation in TQELL benefited teacher educators and candidates?

For the third evaluation question, four key sources of evidence were used to evaluate the extent to which participation was beneficial to participants. These sources of evidence include Item one of the ICLC 2006 surveys, the first and third quantitative sections of the 2006 Summer Institute surveys, the first two quantitative sections of the ICLC 2007 surveys, and relevant open-ended questions from the 2006 Summer Institute and ICLC surveys. Details are organized below by the TQELL subcomponent that is being addressed: the 2006 ICLC, the 2006 Summer Institute, and the 2007 ICLC.

4.3.1. In what ways was participation in the 2006 ICLC beneficial? Information from the February and April surveys.

The first open-ended item on the surveys provided respondents an opportunity to address this question directly. The majority of responses to question, “In what ways has participating in the ICLC been useful to you?” fell into one of the following three categories:

- Provided useful ideas such as resources, teaching methods, ideas and/or materials (April, n=6; February, n=18)
- Increased knowledge of ELLs’ issues and background (April, n=5; February, n=11)
- Increased connections with other teachers/discussions with others (April, n=6; February, n=3)

Although April survey respondents produced fewer responses in the first two categories, two additional categories emerged from the April survey responses that did not emerge from the February survey responses. This may have occurred due to the additional amount of time April survey respondents had to process and utilize information gained at the ICLC. The additional categories were as follows:

- Provided information/ideas to share with pre-service teachers (n=4)
- Gained specific knowledge/appreciated specific conference presenter (n=3).

4.3.2. In what ways was participation in the 2006 Summer Institute beneficial? Findings from the survey of teacher candidates

The surveys that teacher candidates completed at the end of the Summer Institute contained two sections that are pertinent to their benefit from the experience. The first section addressed their growth in confidence with regard to specific abilities as indicated by their choices on a quantitatively scaled confidence continuum. The second section allowed them to respond in their own words to open-ended questions about their benefits.

4.3.2.1. Findings from the quantitative scaling of confidence in specific abilities

The directions for this quantitative section of the teacher candidate survey were as follows:

For each item below, indicate your confidence **before** and **after** your participation in the 2006 Summer Institute. Use the scale on the right, which ranges from 0% (not at all confident) to 100% (completely confident), by marking a point on the **'Before' scale** and the **'After' scale**. You can mark a point anywhere on the line between or through the percentages that are listed as the best estimates of how confident you were and are. So for example, if you were only 55% confident about being able to do something, you would mark the line midway between 50 & 60 on the % scale.

You can mark (draw a line through, check or circle) at any point from 0 to 100% that best estimates your degree of confidence. Remember to answer as you really feel, with your best estimate of your confidence. If you don't have an opinion, or if the question is not applicable to you, please circle "NA".

Your answers are confidential and will be grouped with all the other responses to be analyzed so that no one will know how you responded. If you have questions about what you should do or about any of the items, please ask the survey administrator for clarification. Thank you!

In other words, candidates reflected on their confidence in their ability **before** as compared to **after** participating with regard to 30 outcomes and skills related to ELLs and their learning. The scale was as follows:

	Not at all Confident												Completely Confident	
BEFORE:	0%	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100%	NA		
AFTER:	0%	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100%	NA		

Table 24 below lists the means and standard deviations of responses related to skills and actions for the 14 teacher candidates who participated and responded. As can be seen in Table 24, the teacher candidates reported being considerably more confident in all abilities after participating than before. For example, on the scale with *Not at all Confident* represented by 0% confident and *Completely Confident* equal to 100% confident, the mean ratings of confidence before the institute ranged from approximately 22% to 47% confident that they could implement these activities and skills. However, after the institute, the candidates mean confidence ratings ranged from 55% to approximately 91%. The skills/abilities with the lowest post-institute confidence ratings were those related to assessment (Items 10, M= 55%, and 11, M=69%) and to legal issues (Item 30, M=69%). The average confidence after the Summer Institute for all other items ranged from 75-91%. The highest mean confidence in abilities after the institute was reported for Item 1, *recognizing specific ELL needs*, Item 16, *integrating knowledge of culture in specific practices*, Item 25, *implementing vocabulary teaching for ELLs*, and Item 27, *managing the role that culture plays in teaching ELLs*.

Table 24

Teacher candidates' self-reported confidence ratings about their ability and skills before and after participating in the Summer Institute

	n	<u>Before</u>		<u>After</u>	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Confidence in ability to		%	%	%	%
1. recognize the specific needs of ELLs	14	43.57	23.07	86.43	9.29
2. respond to the important challenges of classroom instruction for ELLs	14	42.14	29.40	82.86	14.37
3. provide effective academic support to ELLs in the classroom	14	42.14	30.43	82.86	14.37
4. facilitate improved language and literacy development for ELLs	14	35.00	27.67	82.86	11.39
5. teach ELLs effectively in the content areas	14	32.14	28.87	78.57	15.12
6. identify activities which fit the needs, ages, and proficiency levels of ELL students	14	34.29	31.55	81.07	17.78
7. evaluate classroom materials to select those that are most appropriate for ELLs	13	35.38	32.30	76.92	17.97
8. adapt or modify curricula appropriately for ELLs	14	34.29	27.09	78.57	14.60
9. create new classroom materials appropriate for ELLs	14	40.00	33.05	82.86	13.83
10. accurately assess ELL student achievement	14	32.14	27.23	55.00	27.94
11. provide effective feedback and follow-through to the assessment of ELL students	14	34.29	25.03	68.57	19.94
12. assist ELL students to attain greater language proficiency and literacy achievement	14	35.71	28.21	80.00	18.40
13. assist ELL students to attain greater general academic achievement	14	37.14	28.94	79.29	16.39
14. apply language acquisition theory to ELLs	14	37.86	34.68	79.29	21.29
15. apply second language acquisition methods and your knowledge of the stages in second language acquisition	14	33.57	33.65	79.29	17.74
16. integrate your knowledge of culture into useful classroom practices for ELLs	14	47.14	27.58	87.14	11.39
17. use the student profiles associated with ELLs	14	27.69	25.87	79.23	20.19
18. teach ELLs effectively in math	14	35.71	25.93	82.14	18.47
19. use your knowledge of literacy development as it specifically relates to ELLs	14	35.71	26.81	78.57	19.61
20. apply theories of language acquisition to ELL instruction in your classroom	14	35.71	32.04	75.71	20.27
21. use strategies for accelerating the language and	14	31.43	31.34	77.86	16.26

literacy development of ELL students						
22.	apply the concept of phonemic awareness as it applies to teaching ELLs	14	37.86	32.62	77.14	21.28
23.	apply the concept of phonics as it applies to teaching ELLs	14	41.43	30.85	78.57	21.07
24.	apply and use the concept of fluency as it applies to teaching ELLs	14	39.29	31.74	78.57	16.57
25.	implement the concept of vocabulary teaching as it applies to teaching ELLs	14	37.14	27.01	87.86	9.75
26.	implement concepts from text comprehension as they apply to teaching ELLs	14	32.14	28.87	80.71	13.28
27.	manage the role that culture plays in teaching of ELLs	14	46.43	28.98	90.71	8.29
28.	attend to the role of parent and family involvement in ELL students' literacy and learning	14	45.00	34.14	78.57	20.33
29.	create activities that increase helpful parent involvement	14	43.57	32.01	80.71	18.57
30.	address legal issues related to ELLs	14	22.14	27.23	67.86	24.86

4.3.2.2. Findings from the open-ended question about what was most valuable

A total of 14 teacher candidates filled out and returned the surveys; however, the respondents sometimes provided multiple responses that fell into multiple categories. The qualitative question about benefits was as follows.

1. *Consider everything about the Summer Institute and all aspects of your experience here in the last week. What has been most useful or valuable to you?*

All fourteen candidates responded to this question; there were 21 responses within the categories.

Table 25

Categories and frequencies of responses in each category for question 1

<u>Category</u>	<u>Response Frequency</u>
Teaching Strategies Activity/Games	7
Handouts	4
Simulations	4
Stephanie Wessels	2
Networking	1
Other	3

Seven responses indicated that teaching strategies and activities/games for the classroom were most useful. These responses indicated that strategies for the content areas of vocabulary, reading, and writing were most useful. There was a tie for second most useful component of the institute. Four candidates each indicated that the simulation and handouts were the most useful

component of the institute. Many candidates commented on the handouts being great resources for use in the classroom. A few responses stated that the presentation by Stephanie Wessels and the chance to network with other teachers were also useful and valuable. The remaining responses talked about the opportunity to gain knowledge about other cultures, learning how a new language develops in both children and adults, and how this Institute alleviates fear of teaching a student who is not fluent in English.

4.3.3. In what ways was participation in the 2006 Summer Institute beneficial? **Findings from the survey of teacher candidates**

The surveys that teacher educators completed at the end of the Summer Institute contained two sections that are pertinent to how they benefited. The first section addressed their growth in confidence with regard to specific abilities as indicated by their choices on a quantitatively scaled confidence continuum. The second section allowed them to respond in their own words to open-ended questions about their benefits.

4.3.3.1. Findings from the quantitative scale of teacher educators' confidence in ability and skills

The directions for the quantitative section of the teacher educator survey were as follows:

For each of the following statements, indicate the degree of confidence you feel right now from 0% (not at all confident) to 100% (completely confident). Indicate your responses on the scales to the right of the listed activity by drawing a mark through the line. Note that you can draw a mark at any point on the scale, between or through the percentages that are listed in order to best estimate your degree of confidence. Remember to answer as you really feel, with your best estimate of your confidence. Your answers are confidential and will be grouped with all the other responses to be analyzed so that no one will know how you responded. If you don't have an opinion, or if the question is not applicable to you, please select "NA". If you have questions about what you should do, or questions about any of the items, please ask the survey administrator for clarification. Continue until you have completed all the items. Thank you!

Not at all Confident	Completely Confident
0% 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100% NA	

The teacher educators did not fill out a retrospective scale but only indicated how confident they felt at the end of the Summer Institute.

Table 26 below lists the means and standard deviations of responses related to the skills and abilities of the teacher educators who participated and responded. On a scale with *Not at all Confident* represented by 0% and *Completely Confident* equal to 100% confident, the mean ratings of confidence at the end of their participation in the Summer Institute (on Wednesday afternoon) ranged from approximately 40% to approximately 76%. The skills/abilities with the lowest mean confidence ratings related to preparing teacher candidates to identify ELLs with special needs (Item 8, M=40%, and 9, M=44%) and to developing program components that will lead to ELL endorsements for candidates (Item 11, M=48%). The mean confidence for all other

items ranged from approximately 65-77%. The highest mean confidence for skills and abilities was reported for Item 1, *teach future educators to recognize the educational needs of ELLs* and Item 5, *strengthen teacher candidate programs to include quality training about ELLs*.

Table 26

Teacher educators' self-reported confidence ratings about their ability and skills after participating in the Summer Institute

Confidence in ability to	n	Mean	SD
		%	%
1. teach future educators to recognize the educational needs of ELLs	18	76.67	17.15
2. prepare teacher candidates to respond to the important challenges of classroom instruction for ELLs	18	72.78	16.38
3. provide effective training about ELLs to teacher candidates	20	67.50	18.32
4. provide teacher candidates with tools and strategies for teaching ELLs	20	69.50	16.69
5. strengthen teacher candidate programs to include quality training about ELLs	18	76.11	14.20
6. better prepare teacher candidates to work with ELLs and their families	19	70.00	22.11
7. prepare teacher candidates to meet ELL students' educational needs	19	68.42	17.72
8. prepare teacher candidates to use appropriate techniques to identify ELL students with special needs	19	40.79	27.40
9. prepare teacher candidates to avoid inappropriate referrals of ELLs to special education programs	20	44.00	29.81
10. teach strategies for accelerating the language and literacy development of ELL students	19	65.26	25.68
11. develop components for an ELL program that will lead to ELL endorsement for teacher candidates	17	47.94	32.65

4.3.3.1. Findings from the open ended questions for teacher educators

A total of 20 teacher educators filled out and returned the survey. Some respondents produced more than one answer to the questions and some did not answer all the questions. The following summary for question 1 therefore sums to more than 20 total responses. This question asked participants:

1. Consider everything about the Summer Institute and all aspects of your experience here in the last week. What has been most useful or valuable to you?

Seventeen teacher educators responded to this question giving a total of 36 responses.

Table 27

Categories and frequencies of responses in each category for question 1

<u>Category</u>	<u>Response Frequency</u>
Opportunity to network with colleagues	6
Simulation	6
Increased awareness of / perspective on ELL issues	5
New info / strategies / techniques learned	5
Increased empathy for ELL students / families	3
Modeling of Practices	2
Kathleen Bailey	2
Mary Schleppegrell	2
Other	5

Six responses indicated that the opportunity to network with colleagues was one of the most valuable aspects of the Summer Institute. Six responses also indicated the *Life in a Second Language Simulation* to be among the most valuable experiences. Six responses indicated that gaining increased awareness of ELL issues was most valuable, and an equal number of responses indicated that information, strategies, or techniques learned were most valuable. Other responses about the most valuable aspects of the institute included gaining increased empathy for ELL students and their families, modeling of practices, the session led by Kathleen Bailey, and the session led by Mary Schleppegrell.

4.3.4. In what ways was participation in the 2007 ICLC beneficial? Findings from the survey of teacher candidates

The survey of teacher candidates administered at the 2007 ICLC began with a Likert type retrospective scale (before/now) to investigate changes in participants' knowledge before the beginning of the school year and now, after the conference. The directions were as follows:

*For each of the statements below, indicate how knowledgeable you were **before** the 2006-2007 school year and how knowledgeable you are **now**. If the statement does not apply to you, you have no opinion, or you choose not to respond, please circle "**nr.**" We want your candid opinions--answer as you honestly feel. Continue until you have completed all the items. Please also take the time to comment in your own words where any items are unclear or where you wish to elaborate. You may write in the margins or anywhere there is space.*

In other words, candidates reflected on their knowledge **before** the current school year as compared to February of the current school year (**now**) with regard to 14 areas of knowledge related to ELLs and their learning. The scale was as follows:

Very Knowledgeable						Not at all Knowledgeable	No Response
6	5	4	3	2	1	nr	

Table 28 below lists the means and standard deviations of responses related to skills and actions for the 25 teacher candidates who participated and responded. Candidates reported being more knowledgeable after the ICLC on each of the 14 areas addressed in this section. The areas with the lowest post means were related to legal issues regarding ELLs (Item 6) and identifying gifted and talented ELLs (Item 9). The areas with the highest post means included Item 1, *the educational needs of ELLs*; Item 2, *the number of ELLs in Iowa*; Item 3, *how to deal with barriers for ELLs in learning English and language arts*; and Item 11, *how to deal with the social challenges ELLs experience*. Twenty-five teacher candidates responded to this section of the survey.

Table 28

Teacher candidates' knowledge before the 2006-07 School Year and in February 2007

<i>How knowledgeable were/are you about each of the following:</i>		Frequencies							<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>
		6	5	4	3	2	1			
1. The educational needs of ELLs	Pre	1	4	5	9	5	1		3.36	1.22
	Post	1	13 [†]	6	4	0	0		4.50	0.84
2. The number of ELLs in Iowa	Pre	1	3	5	5	6	5		2.92	1.47
	Post	2	13	8	0	2	0		4.52	0.96
3. How to deal with barriers for ELLs in learning English and language arts	Pre	2	0	5	8	9	1		3.00	1.22
	Post	2	10	11	2	0	0		4.48	0.77
4. How to deal with barriers for ELLs in learning mathematics	Pre	0	2	3	5	8	6		2.46	1.25
	Post	1	6	7	6	2	1		3.78	1.20
5. How to deal with barriers for ELLs in learning science	Pre	0	2	4	5	8	5		2.58	1.25
	Post	1	7	6	3	4	2		3.65	1.43
6. How to deal with legal issues regarding ELLs	Pre	0	0	2	7	8	6		2.22	0.95
	Post	0	0	8	4	8	2		2.82	1.05
7. How to implement pedagogical techniques that support ELLs	Pre	1	2	3	5	7	5		2.70	1.43
	Post	3	7	8	1	2	2		4.09	1.44
8. Finding and implementing curricula that support ELLs' learning	Pre	0	2	1	9	9	3		2.58	1.06
	Post	1	9	8	5	1	0		4.17	0.96
9. How to deal with barriers in identifying	Pre	0	0	1	5	11	6		2.04	0.82

gifted and talented ELLs	Post	0	2	4	5	6	5		2.64	1.29
10. How to deal with barriers in identifying ELLs with special needs	Pre	0	2	2	6	7	6		2.43	1.24
	Post	0	4	6	4	6	3		3.09	1.35
11. How to deal with the social challenges that ELLs experience	Pre	2	2	4	9	5	3		3.12	1.39
	Post	5	9	5	5	1	0		4.48	1.16
12. Ways to improve math teaching effectiveness for ELLs	Pre	0	0	3	7	9	4		2.39	0.94
	Post	1	5	6	6	3	2		3.52	1.34
13. Ways to improve science teaching effectiveness for ELLs	Pre	0	0	2	7	10	3		2.36	0.85
	Post	1	4	8	3	4	1		3.62	1.28
14. Ways to improve teaching effectiveness in language arts for ELLs	Pre	1	2	3	9	7	2		2.96	1.23
	Post	1	11	8	3	1	0		4.33	0.92

n=25

†One respondent indicated both 6 and 5

The second quantitative section of the survey allowed teacher candidates to indicate the extent to which specific aspects of the ICLC were valuable. Candidates used a similar six-point scale as in Section 1, but “6” indicated “very valuable” and “1” indicated “not at all valuable.” Table 29 below lists the means and standard deviations of responses related to skills and actions for the 25 teacher candidates who participated and responded. Most items had a mean of at least 4.00, though lower means were reported for Item 5, *learning about barriers for ELLs in learning science*; Item 10, *learning how to provide educational support for gifted ELLs*; and Item 11, *learning how to provide educational support for ELLs with special needs*. Items with the highest means included Item 2, *learning about the needs of ELLs*; Item 3, *understanding the development of ELLs’ academic language*; and Item 6, *learning about barriers for ELLs in learning language arts*.

Table 29

Teacher candidates’ value rankings of specific aspects of the ICLC

<i>How valuable was participating in the ICLC for each of the following:</i>	Frequencies						<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>
	<i>6</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>1</i>		
1. Learning about the characteristics of ELLs	5	7	7	6	0	0	4.44	1.08
2. Learning about the needs of ELLs	7	7	7	4	0	0	4.68	1.07
3. Understanding the development of ELLs’ academic language	9	7	4	5	0	0	4.80	1.15
4. Learning about barriers for ELLs in learning math	3	6	5	3	3	1	4.00	1.45
5. Learning about barriers for ELLs in learning science	3	5	5	5	2	1	3.95	1.40

6. Learning about barriers for ELLs in learning language arts	4	9	9	2	0	0		4.63	0.88
7. Learning about pedagogical techniques that support ELLs	5	5	6	4	3	0		4.22	1.35
8. Learning about the social challenges for ELLs	6	7	8	2	2	0		4.52	1.19
9. Learning how to provide educational support for ELLs	7	8	4	3	3	0		4.52	1.36
10. Learning how to provide educational support for gifted ELLs	3	0	8	3	5	3		3.27	1.55
11. Learning how to provide educational support for ELLs with special needs	2	3	7	4	6	2		3.38	1.44
12. Understanding some of the challenges ELLs face inside the classroom	5	8	7	3	1	0		4.54	1.10
13. Learning about differences in the backgrounds of ELLs	8	2	4	6	4	0		4.17	1.55
14. Learning about differences in the skills for ELLs	7	4	4	6	3	1		4.12	1.56
15. Learning about differences in ELLs' talents to be developed	5	4	5	6	3	0		4.09	1.38

The survey provided teacher candidates the opportunity to respond to two open-ended questions related to benefits of the ICLC conference for them as (future) teachers of ELLs. The questions and the responses the candidates provided are listed in the next sub-section.

Consider everything about the ICLC and all aspects of your experience here. What has been most valuable to you?

Twenty-one candidates responded to the first question, giving a total of 36 responses. Table 30 lists the categories used to classify the responses and the number of responses in each category. A brief narrative description of the responses with additional detail about typical elaborations within responses follows the table.

Table 30

Categories and frequencies of responses in each category for the question: *What has been most valuable to you?*

Category	Response Frequency
New learning and strategies	10

Specific sessions	8
Specific presenters/session hosts	6
Networking with teachers, presenters, and vendors	5
Background information about ELL education	3
Other	4

The largest number of responses indicated that participants most valued learning new knowledge and classroom strategies. The next largest category included responses identifying particular sessions as most useful. Specific sessions mentioned included vocabulary sessions, Picture Word Induction Model (PWIM), the session on authentic materials, the art seminar, the panel of teachers at different levels of service, the Read Naturally session, and sessions on Tuesday. Six responses identified specific presenters or session hosts, including Lily Wong Fillmore, Janna Fox, Martha Newton, and Tou Ger Xiong. Five responses indicated that participants valued the opportunity to network with teachers, presenters, and vendors. Three responses indicated participants valued learning background information about ELL education. Specific comments in this category included learning about issues in the field of multicultural education, learning about the basics of teaching ELLs, and learning about the importance of a base-foundation of understanding. Other comments included that participants valued having a choice of sessions to attend, seeing the available curriculum, and listening to ELLs' perspectives on what does and does not work. One response commented that it was valuable to hear concepts learned in the classroom discussed at the ICLC.

A second question asked teacher candidates:

What made you want to attend the ICLC?

Twenty-three candidates provided 31 benefits from attending the conference. Table 31 lists the categories used to organize the 31 responses and the number of responses in each category. A brief narrative description of the responses with additional detail about typical elaborations within responses follows the table.

Table 31

Categories and frequencies of responses in each category to the question: *What made you want to attend the ICLC?*

Category	Response Frequency
Interest in teaching ELLs	13
Resources acquired	10
Professor or college participation in TQELL	5
Other	3

The category with the most responses indicated participants were motivated to attend by interest in ELL education or the desire to teach ELL/ESL. Three responses in this category mentioned that the respondents were pursuing ESL endorsements. One response in this category indicated the participant was interested in teaching abroad. In the next category, ten responses indicated participants were motivated by an interest in acquiring resources to aide in teaching ELLs. Some responses specified resources, which included strategies and “the opportunity...to experience the mind of TESOL teachers.” One response in this category stated “I want to come also because of the great keynote speakers, the concurrent sessions, and information which is centralized.” Another response in this category mentioned the opportunity to make connections.

In the next category, five responses indicated participants were motivated by a professor’s or by an institution’s participation in TQELL. The other category included three responses. One response indicated the participant was motivated by positive past participation. One indicated relevance of the conference to the participant’s thesis. The third response in this category stated the participant had “little knowledge of materials and the ELL world.”

4.3.5. In what ways was participation in the 2007 ICLC beneficial? Findings from the survey of teacher educators

Teacher educators responded to the same survey as the teacher candidates. The directions were also the same:

*For each of the statements below, indicate how knowledgeable you were **before** the 2006-2007 school year and how knowledgeable you are **now**. If the statement does not apply to you, you have no opinion, or you choose not to respond, please circle “**nr**.” We want your candid opinions--answer as you honestly feel. Continue until you have completed all the items. Please also take the time to comment in your own words where any items are unclear or where you wish to elaborate. You may write in the margins or anywhere there is space.*

In other words, educators reflected on their knowledge **before** the current school year as compared to February 2007 (**now**), with regard to 14 areas of knowledge related to ELLs and their learning. The scale was as follows:

Very Knowledgeable						Not at all Knowledgeable	No Response
6	5	4	3	2	1		nr

Table 32 below lists the means and standard deviations of responses related to skills and actions for the 17 teacher educators who participated and responded. Educators reported being more knowledgeable regarding each item after the ICLC, though many of the differences were small. The areas with the lowest post means included Item 8, *how to deal with legal issues regarding ELLs*; Item 10, *how to deal with barriers in identifying gifted and talented ELLs*; Item 11, *how to deal with barriers in identifying ELLs with special needs*; and Item 13, *ways to improve the teaching effectiveness in math for ELLs*.

Table 32

Teacher educators’ knowledge before the 2006-07 school year and now

How knowledgeable were/are you about each of the	Frequencies
---	-------------

<i>following:</i>		6	5	4	3	2	1		Mean	SD
1. The educational needs of ELLs	Pre	1	3 [†]	2	5	2	0		4.21	1.45
	Post	6	2	7	2	0	0		4.71	1.10
2. The number of ELLs in Iowa	Pre	2	2	3	7	2	1		3.53	1.37
	Post	2	7	4	3	0	1		4.29	1.26
3. How to deal with barriers for ELLs in learning English and language arts	Pre	2	6	0	6	2	1		3.82	1.51
	Post	2	5 [†]	7	1	0	0		4.59	0.84
4. How to deal with barriers for ELLs in learning mathematics	Pre	1	2	3	5	3	1		3.33	1.35
	Post	1	3	7	1	1	1		3.93	1.27
5. How to deal with barriers for ELLs in learning science	Pre	1	3	2	4	4	1		3.33	1.45
	Post	1	5	4	1	2	1		3.93	1.44
6. Methods to improve the preparation of new teachers working with ELLs	Pre	2	2	6	4	2	1		3.71	1.36
	Post	3	6 [†]	4	2	0	0		4.72	0.97
7. How to implement pedagogical techniques that support ELLs	Pre	3	1 [†]	4	5	2	1		3.79	1.51
	Post	4	4	7	1	0	0		4.69	0.95
8. How to deal with legal issues regarding ELLs	Pre	1	1	3	5	3	4		2.82	1.47
	Post	1	1	7	2	2	3		3.25	1.48
9. Finding and implementing curricula that support ELLs' learning	Pre	2	3	3	5	4	0		3.65	1.37
	Post	4	2 [†]	6	3	0	0		4.53	1.12
10. How to deal with barriers in identifying gifted and talented ELLs	Pre	0	1	5	6	1	3		3.00	1.21
	Post	0	2	6	5	0	2		3.40	1.18
11. How to deal with barriers in identifying ELLs with special needs	Pre	0	2	5	4	2	3		3.06	1.34
	Post	0	4	7	1	1	2		3.67	1.35
12. How to deal with the social challenges that ELLs experience	Pre	1	5	3	5	2	1		3.71	1.36
	Post	3	6	5	2	0	0		4.63	0.96
13. Ways to improve the teaching effectiveness in math for ELLs	Pre	1	1	5	3	2	3		3.13	1.51
	Post	1	3	6	1	1	2		3.71	1.49
14. Ways to improve the teaching effectiveness in science for ELLs	Pre	1	2	4	2	4	2		3.20	1.52
	Post	1	5	4	1	2	1		3.93	1.44
15. Ways to improve the teaching effectiveness in language arts for ELLs	Pre	3	3	4	4	2	1		3.88	1.50
	Post	4	4 [†]	5	2	0	0		4.72	1.03

n=17

[†]One respondent indicated both 6 and 5

The second quantitative section of the survey allowed teacher educators to indicate the extent to which specific aspects of the ICLC were valuable. Table 33 below lists the means and standard deviations of responses related to skills and actions for the 17 teacher educators who participated and responded. Two-thirds of the items received a mean of 4.00 or above. Lower means were reported for Item 4, *learning about barriers for ELLs in learning math*; Item 5,

learning about barriers for ELLs in learning science; Item 10, learning how to provide educational support for gifted ELLs; Item 11, learning how to provide educational support for ELLs with special needs; and Item 15, learning about differences in ELLs' talents to be developed.

Table 33

Teacher educators' value rankings of specific aspects of the ICLC

<i>How valuable was participating in the ICLC for each of the following:</i>	Frequencies						<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>
	<i>6</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>1</i>		
1. Learning about the characteristics of ELLs	4	5	4	1	2	0	4.50	1.32
2. Learning about the needs of ELLs	4	5	4	4	0	0	4.53	1.12
3. Understanding the development of ELLs' academic language	4	4	6	2	1	0	4.47	1.18
4. Learning about barriers for ELLs in learning math	1	2	6	2	1	2	3.57	1.45
5. Learning about barriers for ELLs in learning science	1	2	3	4	4	0	3.43	1.28
6. Learning about barriers for ELLs in learning language arts	1	6	4	4	1	0	4.13	1.09
7. Learning about pedagogical techniques that support ELLs	3	3	5	5	0	0	4.25	1.13
8. Learning about the social challenges for ELLs	3	4	6	4	0	0	4.35	1.06
9. Learning how to provide educational support for ELLs	3	3	5	4	1	0	4.19	1.22
10. Learning how to provide educational support for gifted ELLs	1	2	4	3	2	2	3.36	1.50
11. Learning how to provide educational support for ELLs with special needs	1	2	6	2	2	1	3.64	1.34
12. Understanding some of the challenges ELLs face inside the classroom	3	4	5	3	2	0	4.18	1.29
13. Learning about differences in the backgrounds of ELLs	3	4	5	4	1	0	4.24	1.20
14. Learning about differences in the skills for ELLs	3	2	7	3	1	1	4.00	1.37
15. Learning about differences in ELLs'	2	1	4	6	1	1	3.60	1.35

talents to be developed									
-------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Qualitative, Questions 1 and 2

The teacher educators also had the opportunity to respond to two open-ended questions about their benefit from the conference. The sections and tables that follow summarize the open-ended responses of the 17 teacher educators who completed and returned the surveys. Respondents sometimes provided multiple responses that fell into multiple categories, leading to more than 17 responses for each question. The first question asked educators:

Consider everything about the ICLC and all aspects of your experience here. What has been most valuable to you?

Sixteen educators responded to the first question, giving a total of 19 responses. Table 34 lists the categories used to classify the responses and the number of responses in each category. A brief narrative description of the responses with additional detail about typical elaborations within responses follows the table.

Table 34

Categories and frequencies of responses in each category for question: *What has been most valuable to you?*

Category	Response Frequency
Networking	5
Specific presenters	5
Discussions with other educators and students	4
Access to materials	2
Other	3

Five responses indicated teacher educators most valued the opportunity to network. In the next category, five responses referred to specific presenters or presentations as most valuable, including Tou Ger Xiong, Lily Wong Fillmore, the keynote speakers, and Kathleen Olson's session on low-level learners. In the next category, responses indicated that participants valued discussion with other educators and students in the context of the ICLC; this category included a comment that the respondent valued being able to observe the reactions of pre-service teachers to the conference and the information provided. Another comment referred to "breakout sessions." Two responses referred to materials: one response indicated that being able to look at textbooks was valuable and one response indicated that it was valuable to see samples of teacher-made materials for use with ELLs. One response mentioned that it was valuable to have time to reflect during presentations. One response indicated receiving fresh ideas as valuable. One response indicated that the range of topics from elementary to adult ELL education was valuable.

A second open-ended question asked educators: *What made you want to attend the ICLC?*

Fourteen educators provided a total of 23 responses. Table 35 lists the categories used to classify the responses and the number of responses in each category. A brief narrative description of the responses with additional detail about typical elaborations within responses follows the table.

Table 35

Categories and frequencies of responses in each category for the question: *What made you want to attend the ICLC?*

Category	Response Frequency
Participation in TQELL	6
Interest in information	6
Professional development	4
Networking	3
Interest in diverse school populations	2
Other	2

In the first category, responses indicated teacher educators were motivated to attend by participation in TQELL. In the next category, six responses indicated participants were motivated by interest in the information presented or in specific speakers. One response in this category specified that the participant was interested in gaining background in ELL education in K-12 contexts. Responses in the next category indicated that participants came for professional development reasons, including becoming a better teacher and learning how to better prepare or meet the varying needs of teacher candidates. Three responses stated participants were interested in networking opportunities. Two responses indicated participants were motivated to attend by an interest in diverse school populations. The other category included one response that mentioned positive recommendations from previous participants and one response that indicated the respondent wanted his/her teacher candidates to experience the conference.

4.4. Q4 Findings

How have IHE participants' planning, curricula, and teaching improved with regard to ELL students?

Survey data also produced findings related to changes in participants' planning, curricula, and teaching. Evidence includes the second quantitative section of the Summer Institute 2006 surveys, select open-ended questions from Summer Institute 2006 surveys, and selected open-ended questions from the ICLC 2007 survey. Results are organized for each of these subcomponents of TQELL below.

4.4.1. Findings from the Summer Institute 2006 survey of teacher candidates related to plans for using the information and support for school-based goals

This survey asked teacher candidates to agree or disagree with statements about using the knowledge, skills, and strategies from specific sessions in their classrooms and schools. The scale for each item was a Likert type *strongly agree* to *strongly disagree* scale. The directions for this section were as follows:

For each of the following events or presentations, please indicate whether you plan to use or implement insights, knowledge, skills or strategies in your school or classroom based on the information and/or materials you experienced. Your responses can range from Strongly Agree ("SA") to Strongly Disagree ("SD"). If you don't have an opinion, or if you didn't attend and participate, please circle "nr" for "no response." Please write any comments you have in the margins.

Table 36 presents the number of participants responding in each category (*strongly agree*, *moderately agree*, *slightly agree*, *slightly disagree*, *moderately disagree*, *strongly disagree*, and *no response*) for each session, identified by presenter and title. The sessions with the largest number of *strongly agrees* were Stephanie Wessels' *Vocabulary* and Socorro Herrera's *Reading and Writing* (n=12 each); the *Life in a Second Language Simulation and Discussion* (n=11 each); and Vinh Nguyen's *Parents & Community* and Lynda Franco's *What's Different About Teaching Reading* (n=9 each). All other presentations received a mixture of *strongly*, *moderately*, and *slightly agree*. It can be concluded that at least some of the teacher candidates reportedly plan to use information from all the sessions. It is worth noting that the sessions receiving the largest numbers of *slightly*, *moderately*, and *strongly disagree* ratings (ranging from 1 to 2 responses in each category) were the shorter presentations designed primarily to provide perspective, overviews or introductions to topics. The longer lecture (James Crawford's Keynote Address) also received more *disagrees*.

Table 36

Frequencies of responses in each category of agreement or disagreement to statements about use of knowledge, skills, and strategies from specific sessions

I plan to use specific knowledge, skills, or strategies in my classroom/school from the following ... (n=14)	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Response
Stephaney Jones-Vo – <i>Orientation</i>	1	3	5	1	1	1	2
Helene Grossman – <i>Our Kids DVD</i>	2	3	4	0	1	0	4
James Crawford – <i>Education Policy & Language Politics</i>	1	1	5	2	2	1	2
Vinh Nguyen – <i>Parents & Community</i>	9	4	0	0	0	0	1

“Life in a Second Language” Simulation	11	2	0	0	0	0	1
Discussion of “Life in a Second Language” Simulation	11	1	1	0	0	0	1
Judy Kinley – <i>Elementary Math</i>	8	5	1	0	0	0	0
Lynda Franco – <i>What’s Different About Teaching Reading?</i>	9	4	1	0	0	0	0
Mario Sosa— <i>Confessions of a Multicultural Music Teacher</i>	3	3	3	2	1	2	0
Stephanie Wessels – <i>Vocabulary</i>	12	2	0	0	0	0	0
Marcella Parra & Gilbert Davila – <i>Culture & Legal Issues</i>	7	5	2	0	0	0	0
Dr. Socorro Herrera – <i>Reading & Writing</i>	12	1	0	0	0	0	1

The survey also included an open-ended question to which 12 teacher candidates responded providing a total of 16 responses. Table 37 summarizes the responses to this question, which follows:

On the first day of the Summer Institute you wrote what you intended to accomplish. Please report and compare what you intended to accomplish with what you have accomplished. With regard to achieving your goals, has the Summer Institute been a good investment of your time and energy?

Table 37

Categories and frequencies of responses related to school-based goal accomplishment

<u>Category</u>	<u>Response Frequency</u>
Good investment	6
Learning information and strategies for teaching ELLs	4
Accomplished Goals	2
Learn how to teach ELL’s	2
N/A	2
No response	2

Six candidates thought that the institute was a good investment. Four responses stated that learning information and strategies for teaching ELLs was the primary goal for candidates in attending the conference. Two responses indicated that candidates accomplished their goals, and two responses indicated the question did not apply because respondents were not teaching yet.

A second question asked candidates:

What do you intend to accomplish related to your abilities to teach ELLs in this coming year?

Fourteen candidates responded to this question giving a total of 16 responses.

Table 38

Categories and frequencies of responses in each category related to intended school-based accomplishments

<u>Category</u>	<u>Response Frequency</u>
Implement methods and strategies	7
Save for future teaching	4
Share information learned with others	3
Other	1
N/A	1

Seven teacher candidate responses emphasized the intention to implement the strategies and methods learned at the institute into lesson plans and instruction. Four responses indicated that candidates intend to save the knowledge learned at the institute for use in future teaching, and three responses indicated participants intend to share the information with other teachers and teacher candidates. One response indicated how important it is to understand the biography of all students. One response indicated that this question was not applicable because the respondent was still a teacher candidate.

A third question from the survey asked teacher candidates:

What new learning that you gained in the Summer Institute do you hope to immediately implement at the beginning of the school year?

Fourteen candidates responded to this question giving a total of 15 responses.

Table 39

Categories and frequencies of responses in each category

<u>Category</u>	<u>Response Frequency</u>
Instructional Strategies	4
Connect with ELLs' culture and language	2

Teaching Plans	2
Contextualized and Comprehensive Teaching	1
Emphasize that being different is okay	1
Patience	1
N/A	4

Four responses indicated that candidates would implement instructional strategies. Two responses indicated that candidates wanted to connect with the students' culture and language. Two responses indicated that candidates would use information from the Summer Institute while planning instruction.

The remaining responses encompassed a variety of goals, such as emphasizing that differences are okay in the classroom, showing patience when dealing with ELLs, using contextualized and comprehensive teaching, and trying to implement things into teaching plans. One candidate indicated that he/she would like to implement all of the things learned at the institute. One indicated that he/she planned to implement the new knowledge and techniques into future teaching. Four candidates indicated that this question was not applicable to them and gave no answers.

4.4.2. Findings from the Summer Institute 2006 survey of teacher candidates related to use of knowledge, skills, and strategies

The second quantitative section of the survey allowed teacher educators to agree or disagree with statements about using the knowledge skills, and strategies from specific sessions in their work with teacher candidates. The scale for each item was a Likert type *strongly agree* to *strongly disagree* scale. The directions for this section were as follows:

For each of the following events or presentations, please indicate whether you plan to use or implement insights, knowledge, skills or strategies in your work with teacher candidates based on the information and/or materials you experienced during that presentation. Your response can range from Strongly Agree ("SA") to Strongly Disagree ("SD"). If you don't have an opinion, or if you didn't attend the specific presentation, please circle "nr" for "no response". Please write any comments you have in the margins.

Table 40 presents the number of teacher educators responding in each category (*strongly agree*, *moderately agree*, *slightly agree*, *slightly disagree*, *moderately disagree*, *strongly disagree*, and *no response*) for each session, identified by presenter and title. The sessions with the largest number of *strongly agrees* were Kathleen Bailey's *Teacher Training* (n=12); the *Life in a Second Language Simulation* (n=11); the *Discussion of Life in a Second Language Simulation* and Mary Schleppegrell's *Academic Language* (n=9 each); and Vinh Nguyen's *Parents & Community* (n=8). All other presentations received a mixture of *strongly*, *moderately*, and *slightly agree*. It can be concluded that all presentations reportedly contributed to the plans for use for at least some of the teacher educators. The sessions receiving the largest numbers of *slightly*, *moderately*, and *strongly disagrees* (ranging from 1 to 3 responses in each category) were James Crawford's

Education Policy and Language Politics, Norma Hernandez's Funding Resources, and Mario Sosa's A Recent Graduate's Perspective.

Table 40

Frequencies of responses in each category of agreement or disagreement to statements about use of knowledge, skills, and strategies from specific sessions

<i>I plan to use specific knowledge, skills, or strategies from the following...</i>	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Response
Stephaney Jones Vo – <i>Orientation</i>	1	4	2	0	0	0	12
Helene Grossman – <i>Our Kids DVD</i>	6	3	1	0	0	0	9
Vinh Nguyen – <i>Parents & Community</i>	8	7	2	0	0	0	3
“Life in a Second Language” Simulation	11	6	1	0	0	0	2
Discussion of “Life in a Second Language” Simulation	9	7	2	0	0	0	2
James Crawford – <i>Education Policy & Language Politics</i>	1	4	5	1	1	2	6
Kathleen Bailey – <i>Teacher Training</i>	12	2	3	1	0	0	2
Norma Hernandez – <i>Funding Resources</i>	0	9	5	2	0	2	2
Mario Sosa— <i>A Recent Graduate's Perspective</i>	4	4	7	3	2	0	0
Mary Schleppegrell – <i>Academic Language</i>	9	(1) 5	5	0	0	0	0

Frequencies in parentheses, (1) indicate a response on the border between *moderately agree* and *strongly agree*.

Qualitative Questions 4, 5, and 6

The fourth open-ended question asked teacher educators:

On the first day of the Summer Institute you wrote what you intended to accomplish. Please report and compare what you intended to accomplish with what you have accomplished. With regard to achieving your goals, has the Summer Institute been a good investment of your time and energy?

Eighteen teacher educators responded to this question giving 41 responses.

Table 41

Categories and frequencies of responses in each category for question 4

<u>Category</u>	<u>Response Frequency</u>
Summer Institute was a good use of time	12
Goal: teach teacher candidates	10
Mixed / indifferent about the value of the Summer Institute	4
Goal: learn strategies for teaching ELL students directly	3
Valuable because of strategies learned	3
Valuable because of materials received	2
Summer Institute was not a good use of time	2
Other	5

Twelve responses stated that the Summer Institute was a good investment of time and energy. Some responses simply indicated goals. The most common goal stated was that the participant intended to learn strategies and/or information to help them instruct teacher candidates. Three responses indicated that participants wanted to learn strategies for teaching ELL students directly.

Some responses indicated that the institute was a valuable use of time because of strategies learned or because of materials received. Four stated that the experience was neutral or mixed, while two responses stated that the Institute was not a good use of time.

The fifth question asked educators:

In the coming year, what do you intend to accomplish to help teacher candidates better prepare to teach ELLs?

Seventeen teacher educators answered this question giving 32 responses.

Table 42

Categories and frequencies of responses in each category for question 5

<u>Category</u>	<u>Response Frequency</u>
Make changes in instruction, syllabi and/or lesson plans	12
Include specific strategies addressed during the Summer Institute	9

Focus on issues related to affect, stress, or past history	6
Work with other faculty to make changes	2
Engage teachers directly	2
Not Applicable	1

Twelve teacher educators indicated that they intended to change something about their teacher training classes and syllabi. The next most common response indicated that they intended to implement specific strategies learned at the Summer Institute.

Two responses indicated that teacher educators wanted to work with other faculty to make changes, and two responses indicated that they intended to engage teachers directly. Some of the suggested changes included using more simulations, helping teacher candidates understand the affective situation and stress that ELLs experience. Three responses indicated the intent to address assessment issues differently.

The sixth question asked educators:

What other new learning that you gained in the Summer Institute do you hope to immediately implement at the beginning of the school year?

Eleven teacher educators answered this question giving 14 responses.

Table 43

Categories and frequencies of responses in each category for question 6

Category	Response Frequency
Miscellaneous strategies and applications	6
Work with faculty in the school district	3
Use materials from the Summer Institute workshops in specific classes	3
Revise lesson plans	2

Six responses indicated specific techniques from the K. Bailey and M. Schleppegrell materials, using the simulation, the web sites provided, networking, and the Our Kids DVD with faculty, and developing effective parent/teacher communication with ELL families. Three responses related to working with faculty in schools or districts either directly or through in-services. Two responses addressed changing lesson plans to add a reflective component and to ensure that language goals are included for ELLs.

Three participants mentioned wanting to use materials received during the Summer Institute, such as web sites or the Our Kids DVD, in their various endeavors.

4.4.3. Findings from the ICLC 2007 survey of teacher candidates related to plans for using the information and support for school-based goals

Qualitative, Question 4 and 5

Seventeen candidates responded to the fourth open-ended question, which asked:

In the future, what do you intend to accomplish to improve your teaching of ELLs? If you do not yet have your own classroom, what do you plan to implement when teaching ELLs?

Table 44 lists the categories used to organize the 21 responses and the number of responses in each category. A brief narrative description of the responses with additional detail about typical elaborations within responses follows the table.

Table 44

Categories and frequencies of responses in each category for question 4

Category	Response Frequency
Specific strategies	12
Awareness of needs	2
Continue education	2
Classroom environment	2
Other	3

The largest category of responses referred to specific strategies. Strategies mentioned included Picture Word Induction Model (PWIM), phonemic awareness, scaffolding, simplifying language, paying attention to teacher pronunciation, “fun activities,” breaking down text (ideas from Lily Wong Fillmore’s session), and incorporating language objectives into content objectives. One response in this category mentioned wanting to learn more about the practical application of strategies and resources to know when and how to use them.

In the next category, two responses indicated awareness of ELL needs and getting to know the families of ELLs. The next category referred to participants’ education: one response mentioned completing school, the other referred to getting a reading endorsement. In the next category, responses referred to cultivating patience and understanding towards students and creating a supportive and culturally accepting classroom environment. Other responses included learning more about different types of assessment and sharing knowledge about ELL education and NCLB; one response indicated the participant is still gathering ideas.

Twenty candidates responded to the fifth open-ended question, which asked:

What new learning that you gained at the ICLC do you hope to implement immediately?

Table 45 lists the categories used to organize the 26 responses and the number of responses in each category. A brief narrative description of the responses with additional detail about typical elaborations within responses follows the table.

Table 45

Categories and frequencies of responses in each category for question 5

Category	Response Frequency
PWIM	4
Miscellaneous strategies	4
Vocabulary	4
Not teaching yet	3
Authentic material	2
Scaffolding	2
Background of ELLs	2
Other	5

Four responses indicated that participants intend to implement the PWIM strategy immediately. In the next category, four responses indicated a variety of other strategies, including the SMELL math and science strategy, graphic organizers, building reading skills, and strategies from Kathleen Olson's session. Four responses also mentioned implementing vocabulary strategies, with some responses indicating plans to incorporate academic language. Three responses indicated the participants are not yet teaching. Two responses indicated each of the following: scaffolding, using authentic materials, and incorporating the background of ELLs into teaching. Other goals included bringing more ESL classes to the participant's school, focusing on teacher pronunciation, helping students take ownership of their learning, researching available texts and materials, and using knowledge about Response to Intervention (RTI) and No Child Left Behind (NCLB).

4.4.4. Findings from the ICLC 2007 survey of teacher educators related to plans for using the information and support for school-based goals

Qualitative, Question 4a-4c, 5, and 6

The fourth question had three parts; the common stem asked educators:

Think back to the beginning of this school year – specifically, how things have gone this year as compared with the previous school year in training teacher candidates to work with ELLs.

Part one of question four asked educators to indicate what had gone well this year as compared with the previous school year. Fourteen educators responded to question 4a, giving a total of 14 responses. Table 46 lists the categories used to classify the responses and the number of responses in each category. A brief narrative description of the responses with additional detail about typical elaborations within responses follows the table.

Table 46

Categories and frequencies of responses in each category for question 4a: What has gone well?

Category	Response Frequency
Student interest	3
Content	3
N/A	3
Student or program success	2
Other	3

Three responses indicated that student interest has been high, good questions have been raised, and ELL issues have been included from the beginning of the year. Three responses related to content and mentioned incorporating “ELL-specific teaching” into non-ESL endorsement classes, understanding the relationship between L1 and L2 strategies, and simply being aware of what materials/issues need to be addressed. Three responses indicated that the question did not apply for various reasons.

In the next category, responses related to student success or addressed program growth. Specific comments included that students successfully completed K-12 ESL practicum, that the teacher educator finished teaching a first cohort of pre-service ESL teachers, and that in-service students have reported positive feedback. The other category included one response that mentioned opportunities provided by TQELL, one response that mentioned collaboration, and one response that indicated the participant has been directing independent studies.

Part b of question four asked educators:

What would you have done differently?

Fourteen educators responded to question 4b, giving a total of 14 responses. Table 47 lists the categories used to classify the responses and the number of responses in each category. A brief narrative description of the responses with additional detail about typical elaborations within responses follows the table.

Table 47

Categories and frequencies of responses in each category for question 4b

Category	Response Frequency
Implementation and focus	5
Resources and preparation	4
N/A	2
Other	3

Responses in the largest category related to classroom practice. Teacher educators indicated they would have changed the order of chapters covered, allowed more time for class discussion, provided field experience with ELLs, and found more time. Responses in this category also mentioned not minimizing ELL strategies and focusing more on a learner-centered approach. In the next category, responses indicated participants would double-check online resources, use a better text, interview practicing teachers about strategies and assessment techniques, and strengthen their own background and understanding.

Two responses indicated the question did not apply. The “other” category included one response that mentioned assessment, one response that indicated the participant would have liked to increase the involvement of students and faculty, and one response that indicated the participant would not change anything.

Part c of question four asked educators:

How, if at all, has your confidence in training teacher candidates to work with ELLs changed?

Thirteen educators responded to question 4c, yielding a total of 13 responses. Table 48 lists the categories used to classify the responses and the number of responses in each category. A brief narrative description of the responses with additional detail about typical elaborations within responses follows the table.

Table 48

Categories and frequencies of responses in each category for question 4c

Category	Response Frequency
Increased confidence	9
Other positive comments	2
Need more training	1
N/A	1

Nine responses reported increased confidence. Comments within this category included that listening to experts confirms current practice, that participants feel more purposeful and excited, that participants gained practical ideas, that they are more willing and better able to teach ESL endorsement classes, that confidence has increased through self-directed efforts, and that participants are aware of how much knowledge is needed. Two responses in the next category commented that it was beneficial to hear about the preparedness of ESL teachers and that the ICLC helped convey the importance of incorporating ELL-related information in all teacher preparatory classes. One response indicated the participant feels the need for more training and knowledge about how to frame information for teacher candidates.

The fifth question asked educators:

In the future, what will you do to better prepare teacher candidates to teach ELLs?

Fifteen educators responded to the fifth question, giving a total of 13 responses. Table 49 lists the categories used to classify the responses and the number of responses in each category. A brief narrative description of the responses with additional detail about typical elaborations within responses follows the table.

Table 49

Categories and frequencies of responses in each category for question 5

Category	Response Frequency
Reconceptualize courses and incorporate new learning	8
Field experience and real-life projects	2
Curriculum mapping	2
Cultural understanding/ELL demographics	2
Make students aware of the ICLC	1
Not sure	1

Responses in the largest category related to reconceptualizing courses and incorporating new learning. Comments in this category suggested focusing on ELL special needs issues, focusing on a learner-centered approach, discussing academic vocabulary strategies, and finding better materials to use in class. In the next category, two responses proposed facilitating field experiences for teacher candidates and providing them with more real-life projects. Two responses indicated participants would like to have teacher candidates incorporate ELL strategies into curriculum mapping.

Two responses indicated conveying increased understanding of ELLs; one response indicated the participant would like to focus on cultural understanding and to work directly with ELL teachers, students, and families and one response mentioned providing teacher candidates with demographic information about the ELL population. One response mentioned making students aware of the ICLC as a resource. One response indicated the participant was not yet sure of how to better prepare teacher candidates.

The sixth question asked educators:

What new learning that you gained at the ICLC do you hope to implement immediately?

Fourteen educators responded to the sixth question, giving a total of 15 responses. Table 50 lists the categories used to classify the responses and the number of responses in each category. A brief narrative description of the responses with additional detail about typical elaborations within responses follows the table.

Table 50

Categories and frequencies of responses in each category for question 6

Category	Response Frequency
----------	--------------------

Integrate new concepts	4
Focus on academic language	2
Use new materials and resources	2
Awareness	2
Assessment	1
Tou Ger Xiong	1
Other comments	3

Four responses indicated participants hope to integrate new concepts into their courses. Responses in this category specified ELL referral to special education, content-based instruction, math and science sheltered instruction, increased knowledge about linguistic diversity, and “what teachers wish other teachers knew.” In the next category, two responses indicated that participants intend to focus on academic language. Two responses related to materials and resources, including books, articles, websites, folklore curriculum, and the Iowa art council.

Two responses related to awareness of others, valuing their input and expertise, and learning about the issues, needs, and barriers facing ELLs and their families. One response indicated more reflective formative assessment. One response indicated the participant would like to have Tou Ger Xiong come to his/her institution. Other comments indicated that the participant could not select “any one thing” he/she hoped to implement immediately, that there was nothing the participant hoped to implement immediately, or that most of the information presented was not relevant to the participant’s work.

4.5. Q5 Findings

What impediments are there to optimum participation of IHE staff? In what ways could the project be improved in the coming years?

The responses to this question mentioned specific sessions that could be improved, additions to the list of topics addressed, groups dedicated to preservice teachers, and different scheduling. They also mentioned more real life examples and demonstration classes with ELLs.

4.5.1. In what was could the project be improved? Findings from the Summer Institute 2006 survey of teacher candidates

Qualitative, Question 2 and 3

The second question asked candidates:

What has been least useful or valuable to you?

All 14 candidates responded to this question. There were a total of 15 responses.

Table 51

Categories and frequencies of responses in each category for question 2

Category	Response Frequency
Keynote Speaker/James Crawford presentation	8
Music Presentation	5
Nothing	1
Phonics and Pillars of reading information	1

Eight responses indicated that the presentation by James Crawford was the least valuable/least useful part of the Summer Institute. Most responses indicated either that participants were already familiar with the information or that they were bored by the statistics and history.

The music presentation was also rated as one of the least useful parts of the Institute. The candidates noted that while it was interesting, the presentation did not give any new or useful information. One response rated the phonics portion of the Institute as least useful because it was not new information, and one candidate had no complaints about the Institute.

The third question asked candidates:

What could have been done to make this experience better for you?

All 14 candidates responded to this question producing a total of 15 responses.

Table 52

Categories and frequencies of responses in each category for question 3

Category	Response Frequency
Groups with focus on pre-service teachers	4
Scheduling	3
Class with small number of ELLs	2
More real life examples/use of strategies learned	2
Assessment Information	1
Smaller Groups	1
Vendors/Cultural Expo	1
Nothing	1

The most frequent response expressed a need for groups that focused on pre-service teachers and gave participants a chance to network and talk about ELL issues (4 responses). Three responses indicated candidates would like some changes regarding the scheduling. They

would like to have a choice of available sessions, more variety in the days so that participants do not spend an entire day in only one session, and more than one day for the longer sessions. Information for dealing with a small number of ELLs in a classroom was the next most requested experience (2 responses). Two responses indicated candidates would have liked more examples of how to use the strategies learned. The remainder of responses requested a variety of things that would make the institute a better experience, such as receiving more assessment information, having a cultural fair/expo and vendors, and smaller groups.

4.5.2. In what was could the project be improved? Findings from the Summer Institute 2006 survey of teacher educators

Qualitative, Question 2, 3, and 7

The second question asked educators:

What has been least valuable to you?

Seventeen teacher educators responded to this question producing a total of 18 responses.

Table 53

Categories and frequencies of responses in each category for question 2

Category	Response Frequency
James Crawford	7
Everything was valuable / nothing was not valuable	4
Mismatch between audience and session content	3
Kathleen Bailey	2
Other	2

Seven responses indicated that James Crawford's Keynote Address was the least valuable aspect of the Summer Institute. Representative statements included: "the format was not engaging," "his presentation style prevented constructivist learning," and "the way it was delivered to me was not interesting to follow."

Four responses stated either that everything was valuable or that nothing *was not* valuable. Three responses stated there was a mismatch between the audience and content: "I felt like some of the presenters didn't know the intended audience and their agenda wasn't as helpful as it might have been." Two teacher educators found the session led by Kathleen Bailey to be among the least valuable experiences.

The third question asked educators:

What could have been done to make this experience better for you?

Sixteen teacher educators responded to this question giving 24 responses.

Table 54

Categories and frequencies of responses in each category for question 3

<u>Category</u>	<u>Response Frequency</u>
Sessions structured / scheduled differently	6
Additional time for discussion / working with colleagues	5
Make specific additional materials available	4
Additional focus on school psychologists, support staff	2
First-hand / practical info on teaching an ELL classroom	2
Other	5

Six responses suggested that some aspect of the presentation structure or schedule could have been improved. The next most common comment was that participants would have liked more time with colleagues to discuss information or do work. Some responses mentioned specific materials that would have been appreciated, such as book exhibits or a copy of the Our Kids program.

A smaller number of respondents commented that they would have liked additional focus to be placed on school psychologists or support staff, or that they would have liked more first-hand or practical information about teaching ELL students.

The seventh question asked educators:

Do you have any other comments or suggestions?

Five people responded to this question giving six responses.

Table 55

Categories and frequencies of responses in each category for question 7

<u>Category</u>	<u>Response Frequency</u>
Suggestions for improving Summer Institute	3
Favorable mention of Summer Institute	2
Discussion of future teaching plans	1

Two responses made favorable comments about the Summer Institute experience, such as “I’ll highly recommend the conference.” There was one suggestion for a stronger focus on school psychology and one suggestion for shorter afternoon sessions.

4.5.3. In what was could the project be improved? Findings from the ICLC 2007 survey of teacher candidates

Qualitative Questions 2, 3, and 7

Nineteen candidates responded to the second open-ended question, which asked:

What has been least valuable to you?

Table 56 lists the categories used to organize the 24 responses and the number of responses in each category. A brief narrative description of the responses with additional detail about typical elaborations within responses follows the table.

Table 56

Categories and frequencies of responses in each category for question 2

Category	Response Frequency
Certain sessions, aspects of sessions	7
ISU panel	5
Refugee presentation	4
Keynotes	2
Vendors	2
Nothing	2
Other	2

The largest number of responses indicated certain sessions or aspects of sessions as least valuable. Comments specifically identified Dr. Long's seminar, presentations read from PowerPoint or that were not hands-on, the length of sessions, and sessions that promoted products. Other comments included that the Monday afternoon sessions should have been a pre-conference and that not being able to choose which sessions to attend was least valuable.

Five responses identified the ISU panel as not applicable to a pre-service audience. Four responses indicated that the lecture on refugees in Iowa was least valuable. In the next category, one response identified the second keynote as least valuable and one response indicated that keynotes that were not applicable to elementary were least valuable. Two responses indicated vendors. Two responses indicated that everything was valuable or that nothing was least valuable. Other responses indicated lunch and the job fair.

Nineteen candidates responded to the third open-ended question, which asked:

What could have been done to make this experience better for you?

Table 57 lists the categories used to organize the 30 responses and the number of responses in each category. A brief narrative description of the responses with additional detail about typical elaborations within responses follows the table.

Table 57

Categories and frequencies of responses in each category for question 3

Category	Response Frequency
Choice of sessions	8
More strategies and practical information	6
Focus of sessions	5
Information received before ICLC	3
Repeating sessions/session notes	2
Practical considerations	2
Nothing	1
Other	3

The largest number of responses indicated participants would like greater choice of which sessions to attend, including being able to choose between concurrent keynote addresses. The next largest category indicated that teacher candidates would like to have learned more practical information and more classroom strategies. Five responses related to the focus of sessions. Suggestions included having more sessions geared to pre-service teachers, more hands-on activities, more sessions on science and math, more information on instructing young ELLs, and more information about teaching English abroad and on counseling immigrants and refugees in the United States.

Three responses related to information received prior to the ICLC. Suggestions included distributing synopses of seminars to aid in team planning, informing participants that they should bring money for vendors and resumes for the job fair, and helping participants determine which sessions would be most beneficial given their needs. In the next category, responses suggested repeating sessions so that more people could attend them or providing notes from sessions to those who were interested but unable to attend.

Two responses related to practical considerations: one suggested taking the climate into account when scheduling the ICLC, one suggested making provisions for a two-hour snow-delay in the event of inclement weather. One response indicated the participant had no suggestions. Other suggestions included improving the job fair, summarizing Dr. Long's presentation in a brochure, and making "a separate schedule for easy reading."

Seventeen candidates answered the seventh open-ended question, which asked:

Do you have any other comments or suggestions?

Table 58 lists the categories used to organize the 22 responses and the number of responses in each category. A brief narrative description of the responses with additional detail about typical elaborations within responses follows the table.

Table 58

Categories and frequencies of responses in each category for question 7

Category	Response Frequency
Session topics	6
Positive comments	4
Schedule	3
Food	3
Facilities	2
Criticism of ISU panel	2
Choice of sessions	2
Other	3

Within the first category, there were six suggested topics of interest. They included more math and science, gifted students, special needs, more specific models instead of general concerns, videos of ELLs, and hearing from ELLs themselves about what makes for successful learning. In the next category, positive comments included that participants hope to attend in the future and intend to encourage others to attend, that financial assistance made attendance possible, and that the Wednesday morning art seminar was the highlight of the conference.

In the next category, two responses requested that breaks be observed and one response requested that sessions end promptly as scheduled. Three responses related to food: one indicated that lunch both days was unfortunate and two complained that people who signed up for vegetarian meals were not able to get them. The next category related to the facilities, and comments indicated that it was frequently too cold to be able to concentrate. Two responses offered criticism of the ISU panel, including the statement that the panel “wouldn’t be vital for students already in school.” Two responses indicated participants would have appreciated the option to choose sessions.

Other comments included that the publisher booths were cramped, that the conference should not be held during the winter, that information about the grant should be provided up front, and that the Tuesday afternoon workshops should be held before the conference to provide background and to not take time away from attending more practical sessions.

4.5.4. In what was could the project be improved? Findings from the ICLC 2007 survey of teacher educators

Qualitative Questions 2, 3, and 8

The second question asked educators:

What has been least valuable to you?

Twelve educators responded to the second question, yielding a total of 13 responses. Table 59 lists the categories used to classify the responses and the number of responses in each category. A brief narrative description of the responses with additional detail about typical elaborations within responses follows the table.

Table 59

Categories and frequencies of responses in each category for question 2

Category	Response Frequency
Certain sessions or presenters	5
Food	3
Keynotes	2
Nothing	2
Vendors	1

Five response specified certain sessions or types of sessions as least valuable, including sessions geared toward adult education and large sessions without handouts, including Ron Long's session on scaffolding, and Lynda Franco's session on adult ESL programs. Other comments in this category included frustration with "the speaker from Washington" and the observation that having choice of sessions mitigated the fact that some of the sessions were less valuable.

Three responses indicated that the food was disappointing, that vegetarian meals were not available to those who requested them, and that the food was unhealthy. Two responses indicated that the keynote addresses were least valuable. Two responses indicated that nothing was least valuable or that everything had significant value. One response indicated the vendors and suggested increasing the product selection and diversity.

The third question asked educators:

What could have been done to make this experience better for you?

Thirteen educators responded to the third question, giving a total of 13 responses. Table 60 lists the categories used to classify the responses and the number of responses in each category. A brief narrative description of the responses with additional detail about typical elaborations within responses follows the table.

Table 60

Categories and frequencies of responses in each category for question 3

Category	Response Frequency
Session offerings	4
Orientation	3
Choice of sessions	2
Facilities	2
Other	2

The category with the most responses related to the types of sessions offered. Suggestions included inviting more nationally known scholars, offering more “college-based” sessions, organizing a panel of ELLs in grades 7-12, and making the conference more useful to teacher educators by providing information about how “students ‘get’ issues in lang. and lang. acquisition.”

In the next category, three responses suggested some form of orientation for first-time participants or higher education and community college participants. One response in this category indicated that basic background information about ELL legislation and understanding would be appreciated. In the next category, two responses suggested giving TQELL participants choice of sessions to attend. The next category related to facilities: one response suggested the conference center should have adequate nearby accommodation and one response indicated that the building was too cold and that lunch could have been improved. The other category included one response that suggested better vendors and one response that indicated participants should consider how to implement change and suggested that a faculty member should be in charge of organizing ideas.

The eighth question asked educators:

Do you have any other comments or suggestions?

Six educators responded to the third question, giving a total of seven responses. Table 61 lists the categories used to classify the responses and the number of responses in each category. A brief narrative description of the responses with additional detail about typical elaborations within responses follows the table.

Table 61

Categories and frequencies of responses in each category for question 8

Category	Response Frequency
Scheduling	2
Topics	2
Facilities	1
Goals	1

Positive comments	1

Two responses related to conference scheduling: one suggested the two days be of equal length, the other complained that registration on Monday evening was not open as late as indicated in conference materials. Two responses related to topics presented: one requested information on legislation and political issues that have an impact on ELLs and their families; the other indicated that over-emphasis on classroom labeling resulted in the participant's students thinking that technique is more important than other strategies.

One response indicated the facilities were intolerably cold. In the next category, one response specified that the participant will be working on models for program improvement. Positive comments included that the participant enjoyed the publishers' exhibits and the artisan booth.

Comments, Design, and Next Steps

An evaluation initiative for this coming year involves tracking the teacher candidates as they graduate and take on first-year teaching jobs in order to monitor, via interviews and (where possible and if they agree) on-site or videotaped observations, their instructional practices with regard to ELLs. At the time of the writing of this report, these interviews are being designed and candidates are being contacted.

Interviews with teacher educators are currently underway. Snowball sampling was initially used to sample from educators in the TQELL program. The evaluation team first asked Karen Nichols to suggest five to ten educators for us to initially contact. From those educators who responded to the evaluation team's email request for an interview, the interviewers asked for names of other educators that the evaluation team should talk with during these interviews. As the interviews were being conducted, the evaluation team realized that, given the diverse array of responses from educators, all educators would be asked to participate in an interview. Twenty-one interviews, ranging from approximately 15 to 45 minutes each, have been conducted. The findings from these interviews will be reported in a stand-alone interim report as soon as the analyses are completed.

Metaevaluation

All aspects of this evaluation are subject to quality control and assurance procedures informed by the *Program Evaluation Standards*, <http://www.wmich.edu/evalctr/jc/>, and the *Guiding Principles for Evaluators*, <http://www.eval.org/Publications/GuidingPrinciples.asp>. Currently, the CEA evaluation staff is conducting internal metaevaluations of this evaluation in order to improve the quality of future TQELL evaluation activities. The results of this effort and recommendations and actions for improvements are being readied as an addendum to this report. Please contact the Center for Evaluation and Assessment to receive a copy of this metaevaluation when it is completed.

In addition, readers and intended users of this report are encouraged to send their comments on the usefulness, accuracy, propriety, fairness, efficiency, and effectiveness of this evaluation work to the CEA Director, Don Yarbrough at d-yarbrough@uiowa.edu. We thank you in advance for contributing to our goals for high quality in this and all our work.

